


A Report on the Proceedings

The Changing Face of the Federal Workforce

A Symposium on Diversity



U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board



The positions which all participants are identified as holding are those they held when the symposium was conducted. In particular, the members of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board were

Daniel R. Levinson, Chairman;
Antonio C. Amador, Vice Chairman; and
Jessica L. Parks, Member.

They are currently

Ben L. Erdreich, Chairman;
Jessica L. Parks, Vice Chairman; and
Antonio C. Amador, Member.



U.S. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD
Washington, D.C. 20419

September 1993

The President
President of the Senate
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Sirs:

In accordance with the requirements of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, it is an honor to submit this Merit Systems Protection Board report titled, "The Changing Face of the Federal Workforce: A Symposium on Diversity." This is a report on the proceedings of a symposium on the important issue of workforce diversity convened by the Board in February 1993.

To effectively and efficiently meet the needs of the Nation, the Federal Government must be able to draw upon the strength inherent in an increasingly diverse workforce. This report describes a number of innovative agency practices in this regard and highlights the views and experiences of our invited audience of knowledgeable Federal officials and experts in the field of human resources management.

We believe that you will find this report useful as you consider issues concerning the future of the Federal civil service.

Respectfully,

Ben L. Erdreich
Chairman

Jessica L. Parks
Vice Chairman

Antonio C. Amador
Member

A Report on the Proceedings

THE CHANGING FACE OF THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE

A Symposium on Diversity

Convened

February 17, 1993

The Annenberg Washington Program Auditorium
Washington, DC



Sponsored by
The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

BEN L. ERDREICH, *Chairman*

JESSICA L. PARKS, *Vice Chairman*

ANTONIO C. AMADOR, *Member*

Office of Policy and Evaluation

Director

Evangeline W. Swift

Deputy Director

John M. Palguta

Assistant Director

Bruce C. Mayor

Project Managers

Ligaya J. Fernandez

Sydney T. Rose

(U.S. Office of Personnel Management)

Contents

Introduction and Highlights	ix
Welcoming Remarks	1
Opening Remarks	3
Session I: The Challenges of Managing Diversity in the Federal Workforce	7
Introduction	7
Panel Presentations	8
Questions and Answers	21
Session II: Implementing Diversity Programs in Federal Agencies	25
Introduction	25
Panel Presentations	27
Questions and Answers	37
Session III: Small Group Discussions	41
Introduction	42
Group Discussions	42
Session IV: Plenary Session—Reports from Discussion Groups	49
Introduction	49
Presentations	49
Closing Remarks	53
Appendixes	
Appendix A: Acknowledgment	57
Appendix B: Conference Program	59
Appendix C: Biographies of Speakers, Panelists, and Facilitators	61
Appendix D: List of Participants	65

Introduction and Highlights

Providing assistance and direction to employees to enable them to work together toward common goals is a fundamental obligation of management.¹ When the workforce is increasingly diverse, as it is today, meeting that managerial obligation with competence and fairness offers both challenges and rewards unknown to managers of the homogeneous workforce of the past. In this report, the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB or the Board) presents the results of a symposium aimed at educating concerned Federal managers and employees about some of the issues and dynamics surrounding the topic of managing diversity.

THE SYMPOSIUM'S HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The face of the Nation's workforce began to change noticeably with the United States' entry into World War II and the concomitant entry of women and minorities into both the workforce at large and the Federal workforce. Despite this major development, and the continued workforce entry of more and more women and members of various minority groups over the ensuing years, the question of whether special steps should be taken to manage workforces that are diverse was not widely discussed until recently. The catalyst was the 1987 publication of "Workforce 2000," a Hudson Institute report, whose analysis of how the private sector workforce might look in the 21st century predicted significant increases in the percentage of women, minorities, and older workers in that already diverse workforce.²

Shortly after that study was issued, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management contracted with the Hudson Institute to examine whether comparable changes would occur in the Federal workforce. The resultant report, "Civil Service 2000," concluded that they would.³ While the specifics of the report's demographic predictions have been questioned by some researchers,⁴ the report has served importantly to heighten agencies' awareness of how diverse the Federal workforce already is and to stimulate much discussion in the public personnel community regarding management of the growing diversity of that workforce.

This growing diversity should not be a surprise to those interested in Federal personnel management, considering the active role the Government has had in fostering it. For example, one of the merit principles articulated in the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 requires Federal agencies to recruit from appropriate sources in an endeavor to achieve a workforce representative of all segments of society.

The Merit Systems Protection Board is statutorily responsible for ensuring that agencies adhere to this and the other merit principles in hiring and managing their employees, and central to that task are issues related to achieving and managing diversity. Thus, the Board has long had a special interest in diversity and, more recently, a special role in the debate that has surrounded diversity management since publication of the two studies mentioned above.

¹ Peter F. Drucker, "Management and the World's Work," *Harvard Business Review*, September-October 1988, p. 65-66.

² William B. Johnston, et. al., "Workforce 2000," Hudson Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 1987, p. xiii.

³ William B. Johnston, et. al., "Civil Service 2000," The Hudson Institute, Prepared for the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, June 1988, p. 20.

⁴ U.S. General Accounting Office, "The Changing Workforce: Demographic Issues Facing the Federal Government," GAO/GGD-92-38, Washington, DC, March 1992. This report, which included a review of pertinent demographic data and literature, questioned the magnitude of the labor shortages and skills mismatches projected in "Civil Service 2000."

The studies resulted in a proliferation of books on managing diversity; private companies and Federal agencies started training programs to sensitize managers and employees to the differences of individual employees; and a number of organizations designed and started special programs to manage their diversity. Yet the debate on diversity continues, a debate that has produced no agreement on such key questions as what is required to manage diversity, will suggested diversity management techniques be helpful or counterproductive, or even how diversity should be defined.

To move the debate forward by facilitating productive discussion on issues the Government faces in managing employee diversity, the Board convened the symposium that is the basis for this report. The meeting was held on February 17, 1993, in Washington, DC, at the Annenberg Washington Program Auditorium of Northwestern University.

MSPB'S SPONSORING OF THE SYMPOSIUM

The diversity symposium took place less than a month after the beginning of a new administration that is focusing on reinventing, or improving, government. The Board believes it is fitting and important that it facilitate leadership at the agency level in an increasingly important area of representative government—that of efficiently and effectively managing the growing diversity of the Federal workforce.

Board Chairman Daniel Levinson noted at the symposium that the Board is a particularly appropriate vehicle for a discussion of diversity issues. One reason is that the merit principles, which the Board has been responsible for upholding for over 15 years, anticipate that the Government will be staffed by qualified people from all segments of society.

The Chairman also noted that the Board's special studies of the Federal employment system are concerned with diversity issues, as are many of the 2,000 cases the Board adjudicates each year. In particular, these cases often involve people talking past each other, because one person comes

with a set of expectations or cultural understandings that do not mesh with those of the person on the other side of the dispute.

In addition, the Chairman noted that MSPB has a diverse workforce. He pointed out that in 1992, almost 60 percent of the Board's workforce is made up of women, while almost 33 percent is made up of minorities. This diversity is one reason the Board has been so effective over the years.

Board Vice Chairman Antonio Amador, noting that diversity is both a benefit and a necessity in today's changing workforce, also cited the Board's merit system responsibilities in discussing its sponsorship of the symposium. He said that diversity can enhance everyone's working conditions, not just those of underrepresented classes of people. However, attitudinal changes are necessary before people can value each other as individuals and appreciate and respect differences among people.

Board Member Jessica Parks, who proposed the idea that developed into the symposium, said that she was inspired to do this after hearing representatives from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) speak last fall on the FAA's diversity program in the Great Lakes Region. They described a distinctive organizational culture and the tailormade and largely successful diversity program they had developed for it, and were thoroughly candid in identifying which elements of the program worked and which did not. Recognizing that agencies throughout the Government need to develop creative approaches to diversity issues in their own organizations, Member Parks sought a way to share the FAA's story with other agencies.

Makeup and Structure of the Symposium

The Board designed a symposium that would be highly participative, bringing together a range of people both knowledgeable and interested in diversity, to ask them to address major diversity issues. First, the Board assembled two panels of Federal officials who have extensive knowledge about diversity issues and who are involved in their agencies' diversity program. The Board also

invited a selected audience of about 50 people with an interest and involvement in shaping and carrying out policies on diversity. These individuals included officials from Federal employee unions and personnel offices, congressional and public policy organizations, and academia.

To facilitate discussion at every stage of the symposium, so that all participants could learn from one another, the Board designed an agenda based on panel presentations followed by question and answer sessions, then breakout-group discussions followed by summary reports on those discussions. To stimulate more discussion in days following the symposium, the Board gave all participants the names and telephone numbers of each invited member of the audience, and is reprinting them in appendix D of this report with the same purpose in mind.

Panel No. 1

The Board was privileged to have as moderator of the first panel the Federal Human Resource Management Issues Director at the General Accounting Office. Equally distinguished were the panel speakers, all of whom have recognized standing in the Federal community. They were the Director of the Office of Federal Operations at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Director of Human Resources at the Library of Congress, the Director of Personnel at the Small Business Administration, and the Director of Career Development and Training at the General Services Administration.

To provide enlightenment on the general topic of diversity and diversity management, the Board asked this panel to address the following questions:

- Can and should the Government manage workforce diversity?
- How does managing diversity differ from Federal equal employment opportunity (EEO) and affirmative action initiatives?
- What challenges are associated with managing a diverse workforce?

Panel No. 2

To inspire other agencies to act, the Board asked the second panel of experts to showcase what their agencies are doing to manage diversity and to give examples of what has worked and what has not worked for them. Moderated by Board Member Parks, this panel was made up of four diversity experts who candidly and cogently shared their unique and rich experiences with the audience. These experts were: the Diversity Officer of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS); the Manager of the Human Resource Management Division of the FAA's Great Lakes Region; a member of the task force that is spearheading the diversity initiatives of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); and the Hispanic Programs Coordinator at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Breakout Groups

The last part of the symposium program was the critically important meetings of four breakout groups made up of the invited members of the audience and facilitated by staff from MSPB's Office of Policy and Evaluation. The Board believed that these small group discussions were vital because they would allow the airing of different perspectives and could influence policies that eventually may be shaped or developed by participants returning to their agencies with ideas gained from all forums at the symposium.

The Symposium Report

To continue the educational process begun with the symposium, the Board is publishing this report on the day's proceedings.⁵ In her welcoming remarks at the opening of the symposium, Evangeline W. Swift, Director of Policy and Evaluation for the Board, noted that the report will be disseminated to the Board's statutory audience—the President and Congress. It will also be distributed to a large secondary audience of Federal agency personnel officials, program managers, administration professionals, and other interested groups and organizations.

⁵ The report is based on a verbatim transcript of the proceedings, which have been edited for clarity of presentation and abridged for space.

Following this Introduction and Highlights section, the report includes—

- The remarks made by MSPB officials and panel moderators;
- The panel presentations;
- Proceedings of the question and answer sessions after each panel presentation;
- Proceedings of one session of the four breakout group discussions, as a sample of the discussions that transpired;
- The summary reports from the discussion groups;
- Appendixes with information to facilitate post-symposium contacts among participants and interested readers.

A SAMPLING OF IDEAS FROM THE SYMPOSIUM

The goal of the symposium was to heighten awareness of what managing diversity is all about and what agencies are doing in that area. Our aim was to make this information available to an interested audience who could learn from it and share from it as they move forward in their own agencies. Because our focus was on “process”—that is, on bringing people together to share information—we do not present any results as definitive.

With that in mind, we note that numerous important and helpful points were made by panelists, moderators, audience members, and the other symposium participants. A sampling of these follow.

When Diversity Is Managed Well, All Workers Are Valued and Included

In organizations with successful diversity management, the managers value the differences in their employees and take steps to see that every-

one in the workforce knows that he or she is welcome. Successful diversity management reflects adherence to the principle of inclusion; it aims to ensure that everyone in the organization is included in the whole management process.

Managing Diversity Improves Productivity

Productivity is enhanced when the work environment is supportive and nurturing, where employees feel they are valued and respected as an individual and where their contributions are appreciated. Productivity suffers when employees feel excluded, because they can become preoccupied with being discriminated against, with not being wanted or valued. As the Board’s sexual harassment and Senior Executive Service studies showed, people who aren’t treated well become less productive or leave.⁶

Including the ideas, opinions, perspectives, and talents of all who make up the workforce enriches the decisionmaking process. This was dramatically demonstrated in the address of the General Service Administration panelist, who recounted a training exercise that used a survival instrument to make the point. The scenario was a plane crash in a desert where the survivors had to figure out a strategy on how to come out of the desert alive. The survivability of the group increased significantly when there was a woman in the group and increased even more when minorities were in the group.

By engendering a supportive and nurturing work environment, management stimulates employee creativity and innovativeness, which improves productivity. Such creativity and innovativeness can also significantly advance an agency’s diversity management efforts. For example, a group of FAA employees in the Great Lakes Region who had gone through an FAA diversity workshop were confident enough to take it upon themselves to develop a 1-day awareness symposium for other employees. They aimed this highly successful effort at colleagues who may be somewhat resistant to FAA’s diversity initiative but are not reluctant to talk about it with peers who have already attended the diversity workshop.

⁶U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, “Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is It a Problem?,” March 1981, “Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government: An Update,” June 1988, and “The Senior Executive Service: Views of Former Federal Executives,” October 1989.

Diversity Alone Is Not Enough

A highly qualified diverse workforce is more productive than an equally qualified homogeneous workforce if it is managed well. Therefore, agencies should not implement diversity programs for diversity's sake alone but also to improve productivity.

Managing Diversity Is Part of Being a Manager—At All Levels

Managing diversity is not an added management responsibility but basic to being a manager. Each program manager and supervisor is responsible for making the workplace supportive and nurturing for everyone. Diversity programs won't succeed unless senior executives, top-level and mid-level managers, program managers, and first-line supervisors provide leadership at their level of authority, are committed over the long term, and are exemplary in valuing diversity on the job.

Accountability and Incentives Are Important

Agencies need to have a process for holding people accountable for helping meet diversity goals. They need to provide the right incentives or disincentives to have a diverse workforce, particularly at the higher levels of the agencies.

One way to get support and commitment from managers could be to include performance standards on diversity in the evaluation and rewards process. However, use of performance standards as a strategy will succeed only if expectations are clearly spelled out, and standards are clear and quantifiable.

Support and Involvement Must Be Broadbased

In addition to requiring involvement of agency executives and agency managers at all levels, successful diversity initiatives need full involvement of unions and rank-and-file employees at all stages of the programs.

Diversity Programs Differ From EEO and Affirmative Action Efforts

EEO and affirmative action programs are enforcement mechanisms to meet legal requirements to bring minorities, women, and others into the workforce. In agencies that have achieved diversity, diversity programs are management processes to create a supportive work environment for employees already on board, and to develop and fully include all of them in order to make the organization more productive.

Managing Diversity Is a Process

Managing diversity is not something to put in an action plan 1 month with an expectation of concluding it 3 months later. Managing diversity is a long-term change process with various stages, each with its particular characteristics and problems, all of which are affected by the organization's culture and resources.

There Is No One Way to Manage Diversity

Just as there is no one correct way to manage, there is no one correct way to manage diversity. What is right for an individual agency depends on that agency's needs. To begin, an agency needs to ask certain questions, such as the following:

- Where is the agency on the spectrum from nondiverse to representatively diverse? For example, if the agency is having trouble retaining workers who would add to its diversity, the agency might begin with efforts to sensitize its workforce to diversity issues in order to produce a working environment that is supportive to all workers. If the agency's workforce is stable and has no underrepresentation in any major occupational level, the agency might concentrate on promoting efficient interaction among diverse groups of employees.
- In an agency with diversity, which, if any, segments of the workforce are being treated inappropriately? This issue is key because the

Government has an obligation to be a model employer, by virtue of its position as the Federal Government and also because it is good business.

- What has the agency already done? Has it impressed upon its managers and supervisors the benefits that come from managing diversity appropriately? Has it taught them any of the tools that can be used in those efforts? If not, they might learn from agencies that have already been active in diversity management. Some of the tools or approaches used by agencies represented by the second panel's speakers are highlighted below.

At IRS, Serious Planning and a Global Approach to Diversity Programs

Diversity is so highly valued at IRS that the agency included a strategic plan for diversity as one of its five "strategies for change," to move IRS forward in the nineties. Prepared with input from individuals throughout IRS, including the National Treasury Employees Union, the strategy is being implemented with assistance from an Executive Diversity Sponsor Group appointed by the IRS Deputy Commissioner.

IRS' initial effort focused on the glass ceiling confronting women and minorities at grades 13 to 15. IRS emphasized recruitment, development, advancement, and retention of women and minorities in those grades, and management's accountability for helping to provide developmental opportunities for them.

IRS is looking at diversity programs of private industry and other Government agencies, to see what can be applied within IRS. It is concerned with external as well as internal diversity issues—such as IRS's very diverse customers and their need for responsive products and services from IRS. IRS has trained key people in its seven regions to give diversity assistance to IRS office heads throughout the Nation. These individuals will look at IRS processes and systems to see if they support diversity, and if they don't, they will advise IRS on corrective steps to take. IRS is developing a diversity curriculum, already does

diversity training in local offices, and notes that diversity has been a prime topic in its annual management symposium for the past 2 years.

At EPA, a Startup Focus on Becoming Well Informed

Like IRS, EPA has taken a planned approach to developing its diversity program and has top-level and broad-based involvement in the program. EPA's commitment is serious enough to have resulted in the investment of substantial funds in its diversity efforts to date.

Among the many instructive practices discussed by the EPA presenter was the agency's startup focus on becoming well informed as a prelude to taking any serious steps to create a supportive work environment for all employees. For example, when the Deputy Administrator of EPA asked the agency's diversity task force to identify and study diversity issues, the task force created four subgroups to look at diversity-related workforce issues and practices within and outside the agency.

The best practices group looked at private and other public sector diversity programs, to see what EPA could adapt for itself. The training group studied the most current diversity training courses and conducted a self-assessment of EPA courses. The employees survey group surveyed EPA employees on attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors concerned with workforce diversity, including what the employees think about EPA's recruitment, promotion, training, performance and rewards programs and systems, and relations between professional and support staffs. And the data analysis group studied EPA personnel actions from a diversity standpoint. As EPA moves forward with its diversity initiative it is able to act on the basis of comprehensive, sound, and pertinent information.

At NASA, a Comprehensive Effort to Identify Agency Practices That Support Diversity Aims

In common with the other agencies selected to share from their experience, NASA has found that development of a strategic plan plus top manage-

ment leadership, support, and example are key to successfully managing diversity. NASA also stressed the importance of integrating multiculturalism into the agency's day-to-day business practices so that managing with a diversity perspective becomes the norm rather than the "new" way of managing. In beginning its diversity initiatives, NASA educated itself on numerous diversity issues, including practices that support diversity and multiculturalism.

Specifically, in 1991, the then-Administrator of NASA appointed a Culture Review and Practices Team to assess workforce attitudes toward cultural diversity and fair treatment in the workforce; review the status of minority, female, and disabled employees relative to the rest of NASA's workforce; identify policies and practices which have a positive or adverse effect on any group; and brief officials at each center about findings on their center. The team has visited all NASA centers and spoken with over 1,200 of NASA's 25,000 employees, and its work has been continued by the current NASA Administrator.

The team identified a wide range of best practices, including having a master action plan for diversity; multicultural leadership councils; employee advisory groups; and regular senior management meetings with advisory groups. Also judged important were such tools as multicultural coaching for all employees; mentoring programs; executive assistant rotational programs; promotion of a team culture and multiple recognition strategies; periodic "diversity health" reviews of the NASA work environment, to check for cronyism, old boy/girl networks, nepotism, and other such practices; support of flexitime and flexible family care leave programs.

At the FAA, Serious Efforts to Change the Agency's Culture

In the mid-1980's, the FAA was able to recruit a diverse controller workforce but couldn't retain it. It began to question why, for example, it was normal at one facility for the FAA to lose up to 60 percent of controllers, including minority and women controllers, from initial hire to full development. In 1988, the agency was forced to address the issues of diversity when congressional hearings looked at discrimination in the FAA.

The agency decided that the solution would have to be no less than changing the FAA culture. This meant—

- Replacing hostile environments with supportive environments that valued diversity;
- Enhancing relationships among all employees on the job;
- Doing that by dealing with attitudes, feelings, and beliefs that lead to sexism, racism, and other forms of discrimination, such as that based upon sexual orientation and ethnicity.

After reviewing its personnel programs and how they relate to producing and retaining a diverse workforce, the FAA developed a comprehensive initiative for managing diversity, covering employees from prehire orientation to retirement. The initiative includes training; marketing and education to address backlash and other issues; and development of surveys and other evaluation tools to assess progress.

FAA's training efforts aim to sensitize people to value each other's differences and appropriately deal with differing attitudes and perceptions. Training efforts include the following:

- An intense 3-day experiential cultural diversity workshop to sensitize participants to the feelings and attitudes of others; the workshop deals specifically with sexual harassment, discrimination, and racism issues pertaining to women and people of color. (At the time of the symposium 1,000 of FAA's 7,000 regional employees had participated.)
- A 2-day experiential cultural diversity workshop that FAA hopes to provide for all supervisors and managers by the end of fiscal year 1994.
- Followup skills training to help employees address issues that arise as they become more sensitized to workforce diversity.
- Team-building workshops for supervisors, with a focus on race, gender, ethnic, and religious issues affecting diversity management.

- Leadership training to provide employees with the skills to create support groups and establish networking groups.

CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned earlier, our focus in conducting the diversity symposium was on heightening awareness of diversity issues rather than presenting definitive answers. With that in mind, we end this Introduction and Highlights section with what to us are some of the key conclusions that can be drawn from the day's proceedings:

1. Managing diversity is part of being a manager. It's not a fad. It's not a special task to be assigned to certain managers or staffs. It is automatically an obligation for all managers to ensure that all their employees are included, are welcome and appreciated, and do not have to work in an environment that is hostile to them because they are "different."

2. Agencies should not view diversity as something they can choose to value or not; valuing diversity is related to adhering to the merit principles of title 5 that govern civil service personnel management. Specifically, merit principle 1 supports achieving diversity, since it expects agencies to recruit from a representative pool; merit principle 5 supports managing diversity, since it expects agencies to make efficient and effective use of the workforce.⁷

3. Managing diversity is part of getting the job done efficiently, since it engenders supportive environments that promote the best use of all workers. Since an unwelcoming, exclusionary environment impedes efficient use of the total workforce, managing diversity is a bottom line issue as well as an issue of principle for the Government as "model employer." President Clinton has said that the Government does not have a person to waste.⁸ Failure to manage diversity appropriately will waste scarce resources.

4. Just as there is no single approach to being a good manager, there is no single approach to managing diversity well. Each agency should develop an approach tailored to its own needs, culture, problems, resources, mission, and external obligations.

5. Achieving a diverse workforce and managing diversity are tasks that may have to overlap. An agency can't wait until it has the desired workforce diversity before it works to create a welcoming, supportive environment for all its employees. Depending on the composition of its workforce and the degree to which all workers are being included in all management processes and perceive that they are welcome, the agency may have to work on both achieving and managing diversity at the same time.

⁷ See 5 U.S.C. 2301(b) (1) and (5).

⁸ Bill Clinton, "Campaign 92: Transcript of the Third Presidential Debate," *The Washington Post*, Oct. 20, 1992, p. 24.

Welcoming Remarks

Evangeline W. Swift

Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation

Good morning. Welcome to the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board's symposium on workforce diversity, and thank you for joining us this morning. The Board hopes that as a result of today's symposium, we will be able to identify approaches that can help agencies to appropriately manage the Federal Government's increasingly diverse workforce. We sought to include you because of the contributions that each of you personally have made and can make to an understanding of this issue.

I am particularly delighted at the active roles our Board members—Chairman Daniel Levinson, Vice Chairman Antonio Amador, and Member Jessica Parks—will be playing in today's program. Their participation reflects their personal as well as the Board's institutional commitment to making the Government a more productive and a better workplace. I am also delighted that we were able to prevail upon our panelists to come when I know how busy they also are.

Some of the many questions that relate to diversity are: How can and should workforce diversity be defined? How does managing diversity differ from Federal EEO and affirmative action initiatives? What are the appropriate ways to achieve, maintain, and manage diversity? And what challenges are associated with managing a diverse workforce? I read in the paper last week that a former chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission said, "Workforce inclusiveness is not the same as diversity.

Workforce inclusiveness is creating an atmosphere where the workplace includes numerous talents, and minorities, and women. Diversity is a somewhat confusing term, and some of the employers here are confused in their use of it." I think that is probably true.

The Board, with the assistance of its Office of Policy and Evaluation, will issue a report on today's proceedings. This will allow the Board to disseminate your views widely to our statutory audience—the President and Congress—and to a large secondary audience of Federal agency personnel officials, program managers, administration professionals, and other interested groups and organizations.

Before introducing our first speaker, I would note that our discussions today on how best to manage a diverse workforce are possible only because, to a significant degree, some diversity now exists. I can remember when it did not. When I came to Washington, DC, it was a segregated city. The passage of the modern Civil Rights Act was some time away. The problem then was not how to manage diversity but how to end segregation and to achieve racial integration.

When I first tried to get a job here in Washington, I was proud of my law degree and was sure other people would be thrilled to see me. They asked me how fast I could type, and I was finally told to go home because I was pregnant and people who were pregnant were not suitable for the workforce.

Still, I was able to go to work 5 weeks after my son was born, although people were not happy about that. They felt that if you had a husband and a small baby, you should not be in the workforce. That is not the world we face today. When we look at our Federal workforce, we now look more like the face of our country; not exactly like it, yet, but more like it.

The other day, I heard Vice President Gore say, "The strength of America is in its diversity." I got to thinking about how diverse we really are. Every night, when I watch the evening news, I hear the same words: Bosnia, Croatia, Herzegovina. In those areas, ethnic groups are at war with each other. And I think about this country. We have hundreds of ethnic groups and many different races and religions. Yet, we get along, not as well as we should, but we get along.

We've had many huge and awful hurdles to overcome, and we have overcome some of them. Today, let us ask, "How can we do better?" How can we have a workforce that is productive and that includes all of us, so that we can all give what we can to this Nation?

I think it's very comforting to look at our Nation's past when we consider all the problems that still confront us. As a Nation, we are achievers. We went to the moon. Very soon, if we work on it, we should be able to succeed in having a Federal workplace where the contributions of all employees are sought and appreciated.

Without further ado, I would like to present our first speaker this morning, our Chairman, Daniel Levinson, who has headed the Board for almost 7 years. Thank you.

Opening Remarks

MANAGING DIVERSITY APPROPRIATELY: A MERIT SYSTEM OBLIGATION

Daniel R. Levinson
Chairman

Good morning, and welcome to our Workforce Diversity Symposium. We have the perfect collection of people to explore this subject today. And, in this intimate room, we have the perfect place in which to explore it. Later today, we will have some breakout rooms so that we can gather to explore several diversity issues in smaller groups.

This is not going to be a typical Washington conference, where talking heads up front speak about their areas of expertise to a ballroom full of people. Ours is not going to be a teacher/student relationship. We are all students of diversity, and we anticipate that we will all explore answers to questions about diversity on an equal basis. This approach will work today only if you do not view yourself just as a member of an audience, an attendee who is here to take notes. Rather, view yourself as much a presenter, as much a participant in today's proceedings, as I am, standing up here and getting us started.

Why is the Merit Systems Protection Board sponsoring this conference? I think there are two reasons why the Board is an especially good vehicle for a discussion of diversity. First, our very mission is to preserve, protect, and promote a merit-based Federal employment system. The merit principles, established by Congress in the

Civil Service Reform Act 15 years ago, anticipate that the Federal Government will be staffed by qualified people from all segments of society.

At the Board, we have always looked at employment in the Federal Government from a merit systems standpoint: What promotes a merit-based employment system? What artificial barriers exist that in any way denigrate or interfere with a merit-based employment system? It turns out that, at the Board, we have been addressing diversity issues from day one, long before the term "diversity" enjoyed such widespread use.

For example, the Board issued a report on sexual harassment in the Federal Government in 1981. To be sure, sexual harassment existed long before that, but as the workplace became much more diverse, this issue emerged as a terribly important one to human resource professionals throughout Government. The Board addressed it in 1981 and again in 1988, and we have addressed it in some of our other studies over the years.

We look at diversity issues as a matter of trying to define what gets in the way of ensuring that we have hired the best possible people for the job and have given them the widest possible latitude to do their jobs effectively. Have we modernized, for example, our leave and benefits policies so that a

truly wide segment of society can produce most effectively in the Federal workforce? We perhaps have not always called it diversity, but these are unquestionably diversity issues.

The second reason why I think the Board is an especially good vehicle for a discussion of diversity has to do with the Board's staff, the people who are in charge of making sure our mission is accomplished. Later today, you will be hearing from my colleagues Vice Chairman Tony Amador and Member Jessica Parks, who are both well versed in these issues.

You will be helped along in your discussion groups by several members of our staff, John Crum, Karen Gard, Paul van Rijn, and Charles Friedman. They are some of the people who staff our Office of Policy and Evaluation (OPE) and who, along with Van Swift and John Palguta, are responsible for the high quality of the reports issued by that office year after year.

Let me speak for a moment about how diversity affects me in my job. When I think about that, three things come to mind. Diversity affects me in the actual job that I do, sitting at my desk, adjudicating about 2,000 cases a year that come before the Board for resolution. These cases cover a wide variety of employee disputes.

On a superficial basis, you can tell that our Federal workforce is very diverse just by looking at the surnames in the captions of the many cases that come before us. In a deeper way, a more meaningful way, as you dig into the transcripts, it becomes quite clear that many of the cases that come to the Board have to do with people talking past each other. I am sure this is also true for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and all of our dispute resolution tribunals in Government, and it is probably true in the private sector as well.

There is a failure to communicate effectively because the understandings and expectations that people bring to the job are different. This probably was not as severe a problem many years ago when you had a workforce that was overwhelmingly dominated by white males who had grown up with similar understandings and expectations.

You simply did not face the potential for misunderstanding that seems to permeate many of the transcripts that I read in the cases that come before the Board, where people simply are not communicating. They are failing to understand each other because they are coming with a set of expectations, a set of cultural understandings, that do not mesh with those of the person on the other side of the dispute.

To be sure, we have many cases where the performance is plainly poor, where the misconduct is obviously severe and needs to be remedied. But we plainly have many cases in our area of dispute resolution where the diverse workforce such as we have now, and such as we are going to have even more in the future, is unquestionably a basis for workplace tension that will spill over into actual adversarial proceedings.

Diversity also affects me in my job as the chief executive officer of the Board. I manage a workforce of about 300 people, with a budget of about \$25 million. I am pleased to say that our own agency has a diverse workforce. In 1992, women make up almost 60 percent of our workforce and minorities make up almost 33 percent. Women and minorities are also represented in our professional positions. Probably one-half of our staff are lawyers. That means that I deal with a very diverse workforce within my own organization.

I think one of the reasons why we do such an effective job—and I think we do—in resolving the cases that come before us is because we have a diverse workforce, because our own people come from such different backgrounds and are able to use those backgrounds in a productive, effective way to handle the cases that come before them. Our diverse workforce at the Board helps us effectively dispose of the thousands of cases that come from a very diverse Federal workforce.

I see the benefits of diversity within my own organization, reflected in the work that we do. I also see the challenges, the problems, that diversity presents to us. The Board, like most organizations represented here, historically was a very white, male-dominated organization. Over the course of a number of years, the Board has become more diverse.

That has not always been a smooth trip. There have been plenty of bumps along the road. There has been some resistance to the notion that we will have diversity at every level of the organization. The important thing to keep in mind is not to cut and run when that resistance begins to bubble up, but to confront it, to address it, to make sure that you do not take your eye off the ball.

I also see diversity in a third way, and that has to do specifically with the Office of Policy and Evaluation. We have a very outstanding group of analysts in OPE who have produced many fine reports. Many of these reports are really concerned with diversity issues. So, both from a practical and a theoretical perspective, the Board brings a lot of experience to this subject.

I want to thank everybody at OPE for having twisted your arms to come here today. I was signing a lot of letters a couple of weeks ago, and I looked up at Van and said, "Do you think all of these people, with these important titles and important jobs to do around town, will really take off virtually an entire day to be with us on this issue?" Everybody at OPE was optimistic, and their optimism was well founded, because you are all here. We are so glad that you are.

You are going to make this the important and very productive day that I know it is going to be. I thank you sincerely for being here, and I look forward to grappling with these issues with you, from now until the end of the day. Thank you.

Session I: The Challenges of Managing Diversity in the Federal Workforce

Moderator: Bernard Ungar
General Accounting Office

Presenters: Ben Benitez
Library of Congress

Ronnie Blumenthal
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Carolyn Smith
Small Business Administration

Donald Worden
General Services Administration

INTRODUCTION

MS. SWIFT: We are pleased to have today Bernie Ungar from the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the panel he is moderating. I will let Bernie introduce his panel, if he will come up now.

MR. UNGAR: Good morning. We are pleased to be here, to help you and help ourselves for that matter, address the issue of diversity, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action. The four questions that the Board posed for the morning panel to address are: How does one define diversity? How does diversity management differ from EEO and affirmative action initiatives? Can and should diversity be managed? What are the challenges associated with effective diversity management? I'd like to add a

fifth question Can you truly have diversity without the effective management of equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and diversity programs? These are all very interesting questions and ones that are going to certainly challenge all of us today. They won't be answered totally today, but I think the proceedings will provide you with much food for thought.

I'd like us to begin by considering five elements that can make or break diversity or EEO or affirmative action activities but that, up until recently, have not been given much attention. They have gained a great deal of prominence in the last several weeks, when President Clinton made diversity a key goal in staffing his administration. The factors—as they affect diversity, EEO, and affirmative action—are these:

Leadership. Do we have effective leadership? Do we have the kind of leadership that is committed to having a diverse Federal workforce, to having an inclusive workforce, not only at the lower grade levels but at the upper grade levels as well? As we carry out the missions of our organizations, do we think about the issues that come in front of us with diversity considerations in mind? Do we have the capacity to do that?

Organizational values and culture. Do organizational cultures and values exist within the agencies that would support diversity efforts? Do organizations behave in a way that would support diversity efforts?

Process. What processes do agencies have to deal with EEO, affirmative action, and diversity issues? By process, I include such things as expectations, goals. Do agencies have a real, true expectation, from the top down, that they really want to have diversity, that it is an important goal, and that it is something for which their people are going to be held responsible? Do agencies have the processes for building the capacity of their organizations to deal with affirmative action, EEO, and diversity? Do agencies have the training, the sensitization, and the understanding that they need in order to have a diverse workforce?

Measurement. Do agencies have a process for measuring how well they are doing, what goals they are establishing, what progress they are making, what problems they are having, what barriers they are facing, and what their senior managers are doing?

Accountability and incentives. What process do agencies have for holding people accountable? For providing the right incentives or disincentives to have a diverse workforce, particularly at the higher levels of the agencies?

With that, I would like to introduce this morning's panel. The members are Ben Benitez from the Library of Congress, Ronnie Blumenthal from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Carolyn Smith from the Small Business Administration (SBA), and Donald Worden from the General Services Administration (GSA).

PANEL PRESENTATIONS

MR. BENITEZ: Thank you, Bernie. I would like to thank the Merit Systems Protection Board for inviting me to participate in this important symposium.



First, I am going to give you an overview of the connections between EEO, affirmative action, affirmative diversity, and managing diversity. They are clearly interrelated, and there is a forward movement involved in going from one to the other. I believe that EEO started it all, then we moved through affirmative action and then into affirmative diversity. As we move on, the earlier stages start to diminish and disappear, until we get to affirmative diversity and then past it to the business of managing people.

Second, I am going to deal briefly with the question of can we actually manage diversity? Is that possible or is it just utopian to think so? Specifically, I am going to discuss some of the challenges of managing diversity, as we experienced them at the Library of Congress.

Lastly, I am going to make some specific recommendations on how we can make diversity happen.

Affirmative Diversity

Whenever I think of affirmative diversity, the first thing I think about is Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin with regards to all terms and conditions of employment. This law covers most, if not all, personnel decisions which impact on employees. From the law, we have developed the concept of equal employment opportunity, which ensures equal opportunity in everything: in employment, development, advancement, and treatment of employees. The concept of equal employment is so basic it is even inherent in the Civil Service Act of 1883. That act called for a Federal service based on merit and fitness.

The term "affirmative action" was first used in 1945, in the Wagner labor relations bill, which stated that when you deal with certain unfair labor practices, you can take affirmative action, including reinstating employees, with or without back pay. The term was eventually extended to cover improving the employment opportunities of minority groups and women.

Affirmative diversity is different from affirmative action. It is not an evolution, but it is a refocus. Today, readings suggest that diversity means the

existence of an all-inclusive workforce; one that includes everyone: us and them. No longer do we think of blacks and whites, males and females. Affirmative diversity does not center on minorities, and it does not center on white males. It covers not only race, gender, creed, and ethnicity, but also age, background, education, function, and personality differences. I believe the essence of this concept is to create a dominant, heterogeneous culture, where all employees will perform at their best. It is really not a culture where the minorities are assimilated into a dominant white male culture nor a culture where whites are going to be assimilated into an African-American or Hispanic-American culture.

To understand how this all-inclusive theory works, consider the projected workforce for the United States in the year 2000. A projected two-thirds of the net new entrants will be women. The average age of the workforce will rise. Fewer young, white males will enter the workforce. African-Americans and Hispanics will represent a large share of the new entrants. Immigrants and persons with disabilities will increase their share of jobs. Eighty-five percent of the net workforce entrants by 2000 will be women, minorities, and recent immigrants. Of that 85 percent, many will be educationally disadvantaged from major urban areas.

Now, despite this seeming displacement of the status quo, two-thirds of the people who will be working in 2000 are already working now. They are here now: you and me. We will have no choice but to manage diversity because we are heading toward this big clash, this big cultural shock.

In the late 1960's when I started working, I noticed one predominant group in power in the Federal Government: white male. I saw an African-American here, a woman there. But for the most part, the Federal workplace was dominated by white males. It was in the late 1960's that EEO and affirmative action started in the workplace. For example, the "decade of the woman" came up. It was announced with great fanfare, and a lot of women joined the Government's workforce. The EEO office and the EEO program were needed to make sure that new employees joined the workforce and were protected and not discriminated against.

We had unions and personnel offices. We had grievance systems and employee associations. But these groups, by themselves, did not take care of the minorities and women coming in. I believe that the EEO officers were responsible for the successes and accomplishments that we were able to make.

But, 20 years after the Civil Rights Act and even a few years after the decade of the woman, things have not changed much in the Government. True, there has been a refinement of affirmative action programs, and we are beginning to eliminate underrepresentation and grade level disparity at all levels, but we still have a glass ceiling, not just a glass ceiling for women but for every protected group.

Even though women and minorities are employed in great numbers in the Government, few have reached positions of influence. Until women and minorities actually get there, things are not going to change that much. Affirmative diversity and managing diversity will not take place. Unless we change programs and policies, things will happen but only at a very slow pace. Before we move on and talk about managing diversity, I have to emphatically say that affirmative action and equal employment opportunity are not closed chapters. We have to keep pushing.

Managing Diversity

Is it possible to manage diversity? Yes, it is. For example, if employers recognize the glass ceiling for women, they can shatter it. They can identify talented women and place them in visible positions. They can also offer, for example, flexible work hours, parental leave, and child care assistance. There are things employers can actually do beyond mere recruiting and staff development.

I strongly believe that it will take another generation for the glass ceiling to be shattered. I believe it will happen only when the young men who are in the workforce right now, whose wives work and who view women colleagues as equal, get to the top and are in positions to help women shatter the glass ceiling. Until then, I believe that women face very tough obstacles to shattering the Government's glass ceiling and that they cannot do it by themselves.

Another example is African-Americans. They are not in management positions in sufficient numbers. There is a lot of talk about how we have 38,000 of them at or above GS-13 in Federal employment, but if you think about that, it is really a very pathetic, low figure. Only 7 percent of Senior Executive Service (SES) executives are minorities—all minorities—not just African Americans. The pipeline does not look good either; only 12 percent of mid-level to upper level managers in the Federal Government are minorities. So if the movement of African-Americans into management positions continues to go the way it is going now, they will never get to the top.

America is multicultural, multiracial, multiethnic, and multibehavioral. No one can be pigeonholed, and in that is the answer. We should not try to fit all our differences into categories, but instead try to understand as many differences as possible. Many differences will relate to the U.S. Hispanic population, which has increased five times faster than the rest of the population. The majority of Hispanics will settle in California, Texas, and New York. Therefore, we are going to have States where Hispanics will be the majority in a few years. Despite language and cultural differences, they will join the labor force. They will accept any kind of job just to get there. But, I do not think they will want to stay in these low-paying jobs for the rest of their working lives.

The workforce is already increasingly diverse; if we do not manage diversity, we could be heading for economic trouble. We should manage diversity, and, as I said earlier, it is possible to do it. But do we truthfully know how? I have read the literature, seen the videos, taken the training courses, and listened to consultants. All of them combined, in my opinion, really have not found the way to teach us how to work with people different from ourselves. I think the problem is the fact that most of the experts emphasize communication and adjustment to organizational culture. In reality, what happens is, whites are telling other whites how to manage the rest of us. That really does not cut it anymore.

If we believe in diversity we must ask the tough questions: What are we doing or not doing to achieve it? Next, we have to ask ourselves whether we have hired the appropriate number of minorities that represent segments of the U.S.

population. Ninety-nine out of 100 probably would say no, but if the answer is yes, then we must ask whether the people we hire hold positions of authority and responsibility in adequate numbers. Finally, if that answer is yes, then we have to manage by the principle of diversity, where everyone is equal but different.

Diversity Management at the Library of Congress

At the Library of Congress, we have always tried to take the moral high ground and have always paid particular attention to improving our human resources program. However, just like you, we have not escaped charges of racial discrimination and in few occasions have admitted, yes, we have discriminated.

The Library of Congress has taken the following steps to manage diversity. We directed the development of a comprehensive action plan to ensure equity in each stage of the whole competitive selection process—from the minimum qualifications rating stage, the panel stage, and the interview stage. It is a challenging process to ensure that minorities and women would have representation at each stage, that no one would be discriminated against, and that no group would be adversely affected.

You have probably heard that the Library developed a comprehensive action plan because we were found to have discriminated against African-Americans. Recently, Judge Norma Holloway Johnson issued a summary judgment in which she said that despite the Library's intentions, our system was infused with subjectivity and lent itself to discrimination. The truth of the matter is that even before the judge ruled, the Library was ready to do what we had to do.

The other thing we did was reorganize our Office of Personnel and Labor Relations and change its name to "Human Resources Management." The change hinged on the idea that we are going to unleash everybody's potential. Instead of just using the traditional approach of recruitment, we decided that we are going to develop our staff.

Another thing we did was to implement a dispute resolution process. We have an EEO process, grievance systems, and all kinds of appeals, but we decided to empower our staff and let them settle their own differences. We have an agreement with all our unions to become partners in change. The Library's dispute resolution process is a cooperative process and involves participative decisionmaking where all kinds of information are exchanged. We are committed to fairness and to supportive attitudes and values.

Recommendations for Managing Diversity

To implement the recommendations that follow, you need to systematize your efforts. Also, you can't make the system a small part of the personnel office. It will not work because it will get lost there. Managing diversity is a very important part of personnel management, but it cannot be left to the personnel office alone. Based on our experience, we recommend the following steps for organizations who are concerned with managing diversity:

- 1. Recruit and hire from all segments of society.** You have to eliminate underrepresentation in all levels and occupations if you are to balance your workforce.
- 2. Develop your staff to do more than what they were hired for.** You have to make sure that all employees realize their full potential.
- 3. Work to totally shatter the glass ceiling that hinders women and minorities from getting to the top.** They must be able to move into positions of authority.
- 4. Provide diversity training—it's very important—and be sure that it does not refer only to cultural and racial differences.** Diversity training must deal with people's differences related to age, education, ethnicity, gender, work style, life style, and behavior.
- 5. Manage people appropriately.** As employers, we have to tell employees whether they are doing well or not.

The time is now. We should not wait until the year 2000. I hope that when we leave here today, we bring to our agencies and to ourselves a commitment not just to do it differently but to do it right. Thank you very much.

MR. UNGAR: Thank you, Ben. Your recommendations seem to be on target with what we'd like to accomplish today, and I hope all of us will think seriously about them.

Next is Ronnie Blumenthal from the EEOC.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: Thank you, Bernie.

Introduction

In the Washington Post story referred to by Van Swift earlier, former EEOC Chairman Clifford Alexander said that workforce inclusiveness is different from diversity. I want to quote from him for a moment because I think he captures part of the issue we need to work out today. He said that workforce inclusiveness is creating an atmosphere where the workplace includes numerous talents in minorities and women; that diversity is a somewhat paternalistic and confusing term; and that some employers out there—he meant in the private sector—are confused in their use of it.

In the 1960's, when I first got to the EEOC, the prevailing wisdom in America was that EEO and affirmative employment programs were really for African-Americans. The focal point was to hire, promote, and retain black people.

I recall a set of public hearings with the major public utilities in the early 1970's, when I was the special assistant to then-EEOC Commissioner Ethel Bent Walsh. Commissioner Walsh turned to one of the utilities representatives, who was giving this wonderful plan for what his company was going to do for African-Americans, and asked him what his company was going to do about women. What she got was a blank. It was not positive, negative, or anything. He had no idea what she was talking about. This was in the early 1970's.

The idea that we were serious about women of any color or ethnic group was foreign then. Now the focal point is changing. As Ben rightly

mentioned, the labor market demographics are changing.

Women are expected to comprise about 60 percent of the net new entrants into the labor market; minorities are going to be approximately 30 percent; and white males, only 15 percent.

In the past we talked about a few groups: African-Americans, women, Hispanics. Now we find a more diverse group: Asian-Americans, Native Americans, people with disabilities, older people, and others, as well as the earlier groups. This is not a laundry list. Diversity is recognizing individuality, not making lists. It is an ongoing commitment. It is not something that can come and go seasonally. While the roots are found in EEO and affirmative action requirements, diversity is rather different.

Approaches to Diversity

Over the weekend, I looked at Black's Law Dictionary and my notes from law school, various Federal sector decisions, and a number of magazines and journals. I found that there is absolutely no universal definition of diversity; everybody takes a different approach.

Then I looked at how actual employers, including the EEOC, approach diversity.

Motorola was featured in the Chicago Sun Times last week. The theme of the article that all of you, as specialists in the field in a new administration, have to focus on is that top management must be committed to diversity. It is not a separate EEO, labor relations, or personnel management function. It is a general management function. Motorola increased its share of women and minorities by linking compensation to diversity goals. When you link salary and contracts to a particular function—whether it is producing widget or diversity—people pay more attention. Motorola also improved its profile by making sure that its diversity program is not a slicked up version of affirmative action.

Another article featured Kaiser Permanente, the big health care organization, and the diversity training it provides to all its managers. Kaiser Permanente keeps diversity as a completely separate program from the company's legal

obligations to the EEOC or OFCCP.⁹ It is run completely separately. Other health care systems are picking up on this, and the basic result has been reduced tensions from racial, gender, cultural, and age differences among workers.

As another example, Kinney Shoes does proactive training and hiring together. Kinney points out that its customers come from a diverse base, so it must hire a diverse workforce.

The percentages of women and minorities in the Federal Government have been increasing. However, an MSPB report on the glass ceiling on women in the Federal Government recently gave some startling data on this subject. The one that shocked us the most is that the barriers for women started at much lower grades than most of us expected. I think that this finding would be true for all minority groups, not just for women.

In June 1992, I came to the EEOC's Office of Federal Operations. On the basis of my experience there, I am surprised that in the Federal Government, especially in some agencies, general management is really not involved at all in the EEO process or the affirmative employment process unless there is a complaint of discrimination. Diversity is not necessarily a part of general management, of SES contracts, or of mid-level training.

When I talk to the agencies, I ask them, "What are you doing in your general training programs, everything from Presidential Management Intern to SES candidate programs, in terms of the various EEO requirements?" Unlike with those questions asked by Commissioner Walsh in the early 1970's, I don't get a blank stare. One reason is that the EEOC has ruled that compensatory damages are available in the administrative process to complainants in the public sector. The fact that discrimination will cost agencies money, not just for relief but also for compensatory damages, was a wake-up call. However, while enforcement efforts can help diversity, they cannot substitute for a commitment to diversity.

EEOC's Diversity Profile

Echoing what Chairman Levinson and Bernie Ungar said, senior-level managers make a big difference. Let me tell you about the EEOC experience and then back it up with our productivity figures. I think you need to have a diverse workforce, but you have to be able to show that you produce the product that you are supposed to deliver as well as meet your EEO, diversity, and affirmative employment commitments.

I have a similar story to Ben's. In 1969, when I came to the Commission, I worked in a rather large division made up of several branches. In terms of the professional ranks, I was the only woman of any racial or ethnic group in the division. There was also one African-American, who, by the way, is now MSPB's regional director in Philadelphia. That was it. We were the EEO profile. Every other professional was an Anglo male. I am not even sure there was anybody over 40.

That was a long time ago. There weren't that many women or African-American law school graduates. But let me give you our present profile of SES people, many of whom are promoted from within because we have a lot of people of various backgrounds in our feeder groups.

Our SES'ers are made up of 5 white males, 10 African-American males, and 3 Hispanic males; 9 white females, 8 African-American females, and 2 Hispanic females; and 2 people with reportable disabilities. Most are over 40.

Linking Diversity and Productivity at the EEOC

The diversity just depicted is mirrored throughout the EEOC's workforce. There are a couple of reasons for this. People might disagree with the policy decisions of the Commission, and you know we are a very controversial agency, but there is no disagreement about two things: our

⁹ OFCCP stands for the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

top management's bipartisan commitment to diversity and the commitment to increase productivity.

With regard to productivity, our investigators, who are supervised by SES'ers, closed an average of 92 cases apiece in 1992. Is there anybody close? No. The next one in the Government is 34. The Administrative Judges, who handle the Federal sector complaints, closed an average of 114 cases apiece in 1992. The attorneys who review the appeals closed 135. Our productivity can rank with that of any private or public sector organization.

That becomes important when you are discussing diversity issues with senior-level managers who are not necessarily social-action oriented or who do not have ties to the various communities that make up our diverse population. The goal that we want to achieve is productivity with diversity. Diversity for diversity's sake, in an era of downsizing or reinventing government, cannot be a goal in itself. We have to balance that with the missions of the Government and the particular agencies involved. I think EEOC has managed to do just that.

The Economic Benefits of Diversity

Recently, BNA¹⁰ talked to 10 human resources experts in the private sector for the Conference Board, which is an organization of chief executive officers of major organizations. These experts described workforce diversity as a competitive opportunity. They feel it can lead to increased productivity and profits. This concept, I think, can be easily translated into the Federal Government.

The economic benefits of diversity are being focused on more and more. A year and a half ago, the American Economist published an article about the benefits of a free market economy. The article quoted an eastern European named Tibor Skitovsky who said that the most important advantage of our market economy is its tolerance of human diversity. It is extraordinary to outsiders what we have accomplished. Despite that, we just really do need to go further.

In another context, Cornell University has talked about what happened to the hotel industry when hotels increased the diversity of their workforce. The first thing that happened was, the industry's available labor pool increased. Because of the nature of the business, this is very important to hotels. They found, too, that the customers were happier with a more diverse hotel staff, and they attracted new market segments.

If you go into a fast food franchise, you see lots of older people and kids working together. It was something unheard of years ago. Anybody who manages fast food enterprises will tell you they are nuts about the new mix. Older people are good influences; they tend to show up on time. Since, nowadays, grandparents frequently live far away, these older workers tend to be grandparent surrogates to these kids. And the managers have found that the kids tend to work harder when placed with older workers.

It works, that kind of diversity. And this fast food example reminds us that we can't be pigeonholed into thinking diversity is strictly an ethnic or racial issue; it is also an age issue.

Diversity and Effective Program Management

When people define diversity, they see it as a range of actions. To me, it is the full and complete integration of EEO and affirmative action approaches to the mission and function of the agency's program. It is a recognition that we are multicultural in our society. I define diversity this way: "Diversity is the logical end result or the product of cost-efficient and effective management policies, which are executed in a proactive, nondiscriminatory work environment, where the unique experiences and contributions of each individual are recognized." Notice what we are focusing on. It is individuals forming groups to make a better government or product or to solve a problem. It sounds very simplistic, and you are an audience of experts, but again, after years of Federal experience, I am shocked to see how many managers have not come to grips with the issue of diversity. The numbers we talked about earlier, about the year 2000; the management issues of a multicultural society; celebrating

¹⁰ Bureau of National Affairs.

cultural differences rather than using them as wedges to drive us apart—these things are not necessarily in the heads of managers when they factor in decisions regarding work.

This is going to have to change. The global competition that we face in all aspects of our society is forcing the change, along with a recognition of the demographic changes that are requiring us to have a diverse workforce.

Since the inauguration of President Clinton, several Executive orders requiring cost savings and the elimination of 100,000 jobs have been issued. During this challenging time, it is essential that we manage diversity.

There are lots of challenges. It is not going to be easy. We have entrenched bureaucracies throughout the Federal Government. The enforcement arm is there. MSPB and EEOC will remain, but enforcement is not the only answer. If it were, it would be a very depressing way to have to operate.

Tools for Diversity

When we talk about training, it is not the touchy-feely kind that we used to have. Diversity training must focus on how to improve productivity, to improve the delivery of service, and to improve products.

No matter what approach is taken, you have to look at your workforce first. What do you have there now? What are their needs and expectations? What is your history? We all have our own cultures, agency by agency, or organization by organization. Look at the demographics compared to whom you service. Then take a look at why there are barriers.

We found that mentoring programs help incredibly. It is not expensive, you can do it, and you have lots of people who are interested in it. You just have to do it.

Tell your managers it is expensive *not* to manage diversity. It will cost them to discriminate or mismanage their people. The communication issue, which has been mentioned, cannot be ignored. It is essential.

Conclusions

I think you all will have an excellent opportunity to demonstrate your commitment to diversity at the end of 1994 because of the projected exodus of the SES'ers. So I urge you to look at your feeder groups now. Pay attention to MSPB's glass ceiling study. And recognize that we are going to have to do it without an appreciable commitment of resources.

Let's get realistic and not pretend. Diversity is not an insurmountable problem. I think that you will find effective diversity programs are the way to help accomplish your agency's mission in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

Thanks again. It is a pleasure having been with you this morning.

MR. UNGAR: Thank you, Ronnie. I don't know how Ronnie got my fifth question in advance. It must have gotten over to her, because I think she answered it. There was one point in particular she made that I would like to reemphasize. That is, enforcement cannot substitute for good management. I think she used the words "general management." I used the words "program managers," not just EEO and personnel managers but people who actually manage the day-to-day programs. I would like you to at least carry that thought with you as we move on.

Carolyn Smith from SBA will be next.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. My presentation is centered around the four questions presented for the panelists' consideration. These are my opinions, based on the experience that I have had, primarily in the personnel management arena, which includes EEO and affirmative action.

Defining Diversity

It is interesting to note that diversity has so many different definitions. I will try to help define it before we leave for the day. Without a common definition, we could give confusing messages to managers, supervisors, and employees. I also believe that once we have a working definition of diversity, things will change. For instance, Christmas parties that are regularly celebrated

may very well give way to celebrations called winter breaks, as we become more sensitive to the various religious groups within the Federal workplace; for example, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, and other individuals who do not celebrate Christmas. The idea behind diversity is to make the workplace comfortable, to make it responsive, no matter who works there.

When I think of diversity, I think of it in a very broad sense. It includes the uniqueness of the individual; what they bring to the workplace in terms of ethnicity, sex, age, culture, social and economic class, religion, family responsibilities, and other factors. The list is not all-inclusive, but it is certainly a list that includes many of the characteristics shown by the employees of SBA.

We are born with some of our traits. Some we learn and absorb as we travel through life. Others are chosen traits. And some we have because we had no choice in the matter. Diversity thus includes such factors as personality and personal and political philosophy. How much broader can you be?

The Difficulty of Diversity

The Small Business Administration was established in 1953, as a bank for small business. It looked pretty much like the banks out in middle America, which were mostly managed by white males. Our managers thought like bankers and had characteristics and personality traits that were very much like those of bankers. So it is difficult, even in today's age, to convince our managers that diversity is a reality; that they have no choice in the matter; that they will actually benefit from encouraging and managing and valuing diversity.

In practice, diversity means that we must be prepared to dispense with a lot of our comfortable assumptions. The idea that diversity is only difficult for white males is a myth. It is difficult for everybody to deal with those different from themselves. Each individual will have some difficulty feeling comfortable with diversity.

We have to recognize that the Federal workplace, because it mirrors society in general, will become more female and darker as time goes on. That is not my opinion; it is a fact. Managers need to

understand that in the long run, their operations will benefit from the diversity of their workers. That is why the importance of achieving workforce diversity is sometimes difficult to see—because it is a long-term investment. The work, the energy, the resources you put into diversity today may not yield fruit for some time.

Criticisms of SBA

The accomplishments of SBA's set-aside program for economically and socially disadvantaged business people were criticized for not being enough. These critics have also said that we are not doing enough to recruit and retain Hispanics in our workforce. Have the critics been right? I would say half right. Based on the EEOC report that ranks agencies on their efforts to recruit women and minorities, SBA ranked sixth among agencies that employ 500 or more. SBA ranked seventh in employing of Hispanics. However, we should not use general statistics to hide from problems. Essentially, what we were criticized on was the representation of Hispanics in high-level positions, where they are absent.

The high-level positions that our critics talked about were our district director positions, which are our key field positions. There are 68 of them. Only four of the incumbents are Hispanic. Our critics also looked at our senior executives. And while better than 25 percent of SBA's career SES slots are actually filled by women and/or minorities, only one is Hispanic; one out of 42. So Hispanics are not well represented in our key positions.

Responsibility for Managing Diversity

When I address new supervisors periodically in our training programs, I tell them that it is their job to manage diversity. This is not an add-on, this is not something that is nice to do. It is their job to assimilate new employees into the workplace. If the supervisor fails to do that, what you will have is an ongoing recruitment program that is not supported by a successful retention program.

When people do not feel comfortable, productivity suffers. We do our best work when we are comfortable, when we feel that we are wanted. Productivity suffers if we are preoccupied with

being discriminated against, being talked about, not being assimilated, not being appreciated, not being valued. If you want increased productivity, your goal should be a responsive workplace.

Diversity Management Compared With EEO and Affirmative Action

When we talk to managers about diversity, they sometimes get confused. They think it is the same as EEO and affirmative action. One of the major differences between diversity and EEO and affirmative action is that, to date, the statutes that we rely on in the EEO and affirmative action arena do not apply to diversity, *per se*. They relate to enforcement matters. We do not yet have legislation specifically for diversity. How does diversity management differ from EEO? The idea that women and minorities have rights is not a new idea. It is couched in the Constitution. But court orders have been very important in terms of defining what those rights are.

I think the term "protected class" is very interesting. It tells you that if you are one of those individuals, you are being protected from something. Since you are generally not protected from good, whatever you are protected from must be bad. Eventually, if diversity works, we will not have protected classes because there would be no need to define, within enforcement arenas, what is good to do and what is not good to do.

What we will find, as we go on, is that diversity will result in no surprises. You will not be surprised when you walk into a meeting and find that the highest ranking person there is a female or a Native American or a Hispanic. It will not be remarkable that, for the first time, a black female holds a high-level position that is not in the health and education area. It will not be remarkable that the Secretary of Agriculture is a black male. It will be the norm. Essentially, the goal of diversity is to make the presence of different kinds of individuals the norm.

It is not the norm at this particular time because enforcement, while it has rendered remarkable milestones, has not resulted in the kind of attitudinal shift that is necessary to make everybody feel welcome in the workplace. One of the ways in which affirmative action and EEO differ from

diversity is that those two programs are often numbers-focused. When you focus on raw numbers, without focusing on attitudinal shifts, you will not achieve a comfortable workplace where individuals come to work without being worried about, "Am I welcome here? Am I valued here? Am I appreciated here?"

Managing Diversity at SBA

To manage diversity, SBA set up a diversity issues working group made up of whites, Native Americans, blacks, females, Hispanics, and Asians. This group developed the agency's program, its plan, for diversity.

Assuming that the current Acting Administrator of the Small Business Administration accepts our proposal to proceed, an outside group will present the program. The outside group is needed because we did not want the plan presented by those of us in the agency who will end up being apologists—"I know it looks bad, but ***" or "I know we could have done better, but ***."

We wanted somebody who was divorced from the agency to also take the pulse of SBA, find what was missing, present the results, and say, "These are the facts. These are the feelings and perceptions. These are the things that you must work on."

Should we and can we manage diversity? Absolutely. The ultimate goal is not to do either, because diversity should come naturally after a point. But we all know that in order to change attitudes, the first thing you work on is behavior change. To change behavior, SBA has tied diversity goals into performance plans for managers and supervisors. But our plans allow for underachievement because you can over-manage diversity.

Things that we manage are the things that are important. Diversity is important. It is a reality. Ronnie used the term "competitive opportunity." If, for example, Hispanics do not feel comfortable coming to SBA, and if Hispanics are going to constitute an incredible percentage of the new entrants to the Federal workforce, at some point in time SBA may not be able to recruit. And if we cannot recruit, we cannot deliver loans and other mission-supported programs.

Challenges in Managing Diversity

Let me speak on the challenges we face in managing diversity. You must have senior-level support; it will not work without it. As I mentioned earlier, we built progress in workforce diversity into the performance plans of our senior executives. Unless progress occurred on the part of the executives, they could not get better than "fully successful" even if they had rendered tremendous access to capital, which was the name of the game for us last year. The then-administrator of the SBA supported that approach to performance evaluation, not only at the beginning but at the end of the rating process. So, top-level support is the first thing you must have. If you don't have that, your plan is liable to fail.

Can you truly have diversity without EEO and affirmative action? I don't think so. Although numbers should not be the determining factor, if everybody in an organization is just alike, what have you achieved in terms of relating to people who are different from you?

Conclusions

When people say, "If white males can do the job, what difference does it make? It's getting done," I say, "Maybe you should look at the variety of things that surround you and think about it. If you look at nature, at the creation, you find flowers of all colors. Do we need flowers of all colors? No. You find fruits and vegetables, meat, all kinds of different things. Even within nature, variety is the name of the game. You will benefit tremendously from increasing the variety of your employees, and that goes to the heart of diversity." Thank you.

MR. UNGAR: Thank you, Carolyn, for that inspirational message. Carolyn's emphasis on the uniqueness of the individual plus management's responsibility to make the workplace comfortable were two points particularly helpful to me. I had not thought about them in quite those terms before, but in my new job—which is to help in GAO's TQM¹¹ endeavor—it is critical that I think of the connection between respect for people and management of people. People need to feel

valued, comfortable, wanted, and important. If they don't, productivity and the mission will suffer or not be optimized.

Next is Don Worden from GSA. After his presentation, we will accept questions from the audience.

MR. WORDEN: Thanks, Bernie.

The Education of a White Male

When I was invited to this panel several months ago, I wondered why I had been invited. When I saw who my fellow panelists were, I wondered even more why I had been invited. Then when I saw who was going to be in the audience, I thought, "What am I doing up here? Most of the people in the audience are better equipped to be up here talking about diversity than I am."

Then I started thinking about what I have to offer talking about diversity. I am a white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant male from the Midwest. I am the enemy, maybe, in this whole endeavor. Then something struck me. One of our diversity trainers was training a group, and she came back very frustrated. She said, "They just don't get it." I thought, maybe that is the difference between me and my fellow white males: I get it; and if I get it, what happened in my experiences that made me get it when some people do not?

Four things had an impact on me that educated me and made me understand what diversity is all about.

The first was Dr. Edwin Nichols's presentation on diversity, in which he related cultural differences to diversity. He explained the differences in the way northern Europeans, people in southern climes and equatorial regions, and people in Asian cultures developed. He then connected that with how these people are different culturally and how we, in this country, have to learn to deal with the differences.

The second was a book, "Beyond Race and Gender," by Roosevelt Thomas, that I highly recommend to anyone who wants to read about diversity. I think the book hits it right on as to what diversity is all about.

¹¹ Total quality management.

The third was a presentation by Morris Massey called "Flashpoint: When Values Collide." It dealt with the generational differences in our workforce and how they affect diversity.

The last was a minor thing, but it really brought things home to me. It was a presentation by a training group that administers a survival instrument, which I'm sure some of you have gone through. The scenario is a plane crash in a desert. People survived the crash and they have to figure out a strategy for coming out of this situation alive.

The presenters said they have been giving this instrument for 21 years and have looked at thousands of strategies. Their research has shown that when at least one woman is in the group, the survivability of the group goes up significantly. When minorities are in the group, it goes up even more. I thought, that's a bottom line issue: when group performance depends on having a diverse approach to problem solving and to productivity.

Bringing Diversity to the Japanese Workplace

Then I thought of a problem. We do things in groups these days, just as the Japanese do. Japanese culture is homogeneous, and yet Japan has a very high rate of accomplishment. How do they bring diversity to their teams? I found out that very often, when the Japanese put groups together, they give people the Myers-Briggs test, and they pick people with different personality types, because they have to make up for the homogeneity of their culture. They have to seek ways of adding diversity to a group in order to increase their productivity.

Defining Diversity

I think my predecessors have defined diversity quite nicely. I would emphasize one thing, which I talked about with Morris Massey, and that is generational differences. He divides the workforce into four groups: the World War II

group, the people who were born just before and during the war, the baby boomer group, and the group who are in their twenties.

He essentially says that the problem is the World War II generation. They are in charge of this country. If you look at the chairmen of the boards of major corporations in this country, the World War II generation has the financial power and is the one calling the shots.

I was thinking of some of the differences between the World War II generation and today's workforce. What made the World War II generation successful? Their success was based on the mass production of goods. The key to mass production of goods was uniformity: everyone did exactly the same thing, in exactly the same way, so that the final product worked. They told the new workers to "do exactly as I say, follow these rules and procedures, and everything will be just fine." It worked. But today's society does not work that way. Mass production is more customized. We have to continually change products to meet customer demands. And today's customers are diverse.

Diversity's Link With All Aspects of the Agency

Why should we have diversity, as opposed to why should we have EEO or affirmative action? The three are complementary but totally separate processes. I don't think we should measure managers on the diversity of their employees. Instead, diversity has to be incorporated into the everyday work of the organization.

The program linkages I see—obviously with EEO, affirmative action, and total quality management—get back to productivity. For example, total quality management gets things done through quality teams. Research has shown that diverse teams are more productive. They come up with better ideas than teams that are made up of like people. Thus, we have to link diversity with the total quality management initiatives of an agency. We must also tie diversity into

employee-labor relations program, the recruitment program, and the strategic plan of the agency.

Diversity is also linked to the following:

Child care. More women and dual-career couples are in the Federal workforce. Their need for child care must be met if we want them to be productive at work.

Sexual harassment courses. Sexual harassment programs wouldn't be needed if we'd manage diversity. Understanding the differences between the sexes would result in better relations that would minimize complaints of sexual harassment.

Flexitime and flexiplace. These options came up because of the different needs of our workforce. If we still had the workforce of all white males with a nonworking spouse, everybody would get to work at 9:00 a.m. and leave at 5:00 p.m., and there would be no problem. But our current workforce has a big problem if we have no flexibility in setting the workday.

Reinventing government. Reinventing government really calls for innovative thinking, and innovative thinking doesn't come from a group of like people sitting around dealing with the issue. To reinvent government, we need input from different groups of people, different creeds, different sexes, different ages, different backgrounds.

Self-directed work teams and flatter organizational structures. The hierarchical way we manage Government will end one of these days. President Clinton announced an intention to reduce the number of grades 14 and above in Government. I think that is going to have a significant impact on our hierarchical structure and the fact that we are going to have to get more work done with flatter organizations. As I said previously, a diverse workforce would make a better work team.

Cafeteria benefits. We need cafeteria benefits in our society because we have a diverse workforce. Each of us has different needs. For example, a young entry-level employee would have benefit

needs different from the needs of people at the twilight of their careers. We should be able to provide equal access to benefits by different people.

Succession planning. When we look at succession planning in Government, the diversity of the workforce should be a major consideration. Agencies should ensure that their top-level management mirrors the diversity of their workforce.

The Government's Diversity Record

I think the Government is well ahead of the game in diversity compared with the private sector, and there are two reasons for that. One, because of affirmative action and EEO policies of the past, we have a more diverse workforce than most private sector companies have.

Another is the age of the Federal workforce. We are going to start losing the white males soon. Come 1994, we are going to see a huge exodus from the SES, which is going to create openings all the way down the system. We must be prepared to ensure the diversity of our managers. I have great hopes in this respect because I think we are already getting ourselves positioned for that eventuality.

Implementing Diversity

We need to work diversity into bottom line issues of the agencies. We need to build diversity into the agencies' total quality management effort and into their training programs for supervisors and managers and employees.

For years, GSA conducted a course called "Interaction Management." It is an interpersonal skills course, which could be a diversity course, because if you're skilled in interpersonal relationships, you're skilled in dealing with a diverse workforce. You can build diversity training into those everyday, ongoing courses that you offer your employees. Train all your employees in diversity, from the top down or bottom up. Whichever way you go is not as important as ensuring that everyone gets trained.

I expect to continue with the top-down approach when our new Administrator is appointed. You must have the backing of top management, but not only the backing; you also have to have active support in the way that top managers act, in terms of who their advisors are, who their inner circle is. If their inner circle is a diverse group, that will be emulated throughout the agency.

Thank you.

MR. UNGAR: Thank you, Don. Among Don's points that I hope you will take back and implement are, first, that diverse teams are more productive teams. Second, build diversity into your operations. We could debate whether you manage diversity or not, but building diversity into the operations of the agency—planning, training, program management—makes a lot of sense.

I would like to thank all four speakers. It was a great opportunity to hear a diverse set of views on the one hand, but relatively consistent messages on the other. I now open the meeting for questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MR. BLUE WOOLDRIDGE (Virginia Commonwealth University): What research do we need to do? What information do managers need in order to create a comfortable, productive working environment?

MS. SMITH: I don't think there is a body of knowledge that managers need to absorb. The one thing we all have in common is that we are human beings. Most of what we expect from others derives from that.

When we were growing up, we were taught to be considerate of others. Something got lost when we became workers. All too often, people are uncomfortable because others are not considerate of their feelings. When we meet a person, we do not have a blank slate, we have unspoken assumptions. All of us are the product of our life's experiences. But create, to the extent that you can, a blank slate. Don't assume anything.

Always remember that as human beings, we have more in common than we have differences. So start there and look at the basic dignity, the unique capabilities, of the individual. It's okay to ask an individual whose culture is unfamiliar to you to tell you about it. People are often very uncomfortable delving into those areas because they fear a complaint, a grievance, or something of that sort, but as long as you are considerate, you should not run into problems.

MS. GWEN JONES (Federal Aviation Administration): Two resources that might be useful to those here today are a book by Ann M. Morrison called "The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America" and a book Morrison coauthored with Randall P. White and Ellen Van Velsor called "Breaking the Glass Ceiling."

MR. MANUEL OLIVEREZ (National Association of Hispanic Federal Executives): The panel was very enlightening from a conceptual perspective, in terms of what cultural diversity is and what it entails. But you fell short in dealing with what impact diversity has on Hispanic-Americans. When you talk about cultural diversity as a concept, as a process, you are really talking of an abstraction that leaves out a significant number of Americans.

At SBA, for example, out of 42 SES'ers, only one is Hispanic. That tells me that there is a disconnect between the agency's rhetoric and its accomplishments. For the next 5 or 10 years, affirmative action and cultural diversity must be closely linked to ensure that Hispanic-Americans make up a part of that cultural diversity you talked about at SBA.

MS. SMITH: There is a lot to what you said. However, timing is everything. Well over a year ago, we sat down with members of the Hispanic groups and asked them what we needed to do to recruit Hispanics. We were experiencing barriers and we did not know why. As a result of that dialogue, SBA hired a recruitment officer who is Hispanic to eliminate recruitment barriers.

In October 1992, SBA implemented a succession planning program called "The District Director Candidate Development Program." We an-

nounced that program in and out of Government, including in Hispanic magazines, and included an 800 number. We got hundreds of calls. We not only have an SES Candidate Development Program, but for the first time, SBA also plans to use the Schedule B hiring authority to appoint individuals to executive positions.

Twenty-five percent of the candidates for our District Director Candidate Development Program are Hispanic. It is a rigorous program. The problems we encounter generally come from females. When we tell people to put their lives on hold for 18 months or so, women tend to stay away from the program. Our difficulty is not in recruiting Hispanics; although their selection rate may be a different story. But we key in on recruitment. Unless managers have a list with Hispanics on it, they cannot select.

For the SES Candidate Development Program our recruitment effort has been good.

When the Acting Administrator came on board, I recommended to him to proceed with the SES Candidate Development Program, including using the Schedule B hiring, because this will constitute what I consider to be an excellent step forward, in terms of achieving greater representation. Not diversity. I used the term "greater representation" to distinguish between that and valuing diversity, which is markedly different.

I am assuming that the new Administrator will proceed with these programs. When we do, you will hear not only rhetoric but hopefully will see results.

MR. WORDEN: It is interesting to note that we are talking about diversity, and yet you are asking about recruitment. I see recruitment as part of an affirmative action program, while diversity programs deal with the workforce that you have and how to work with them effectively and productively. Diversity programs assume you already have a diverse workforce, including Hispanics. I think you are still focused on the numbers game. But I hope that when we talk about diversity, we are not talking about a numbers game, but about how to implement a strategy.

MR. OLIVEREZ: What if the workforce is not diverse?

MR. WORDEN: The affirmative action program needs to respond to that, not the diversity program.

MR. BENITEZ: In my presentation, I said that one of the things we have to do is balance the workforce. When you balance the workforce, obviously you are going to have some short- and long-range goals, very aggressive goals—and you have to target recruitment; and as you said you have to target the recruitment of Hispanics.

My personal feeling is that we are moving there, and that it is okay to talk about diversity, that we are all different but equal, and we are all participating in the fruits of society. But maybe you are right. We have to get there first before we can talk about managing diversity.

When people like you and me talk about underrepresentation of Hispanics in that aggressive manner, however, others get so offended and confused. They think that we do not appreciate what has been done for us already. You are right. We have to hire more Hispanics, but underrepresentation is a very complex issue. It is so complex that we should know how to articulate it.

MR. OLIVEREZ: I do not come here as an inexperienced person so I speak forcefully. I want to reinforce the obvious, because what is obvious is often ignored. I have no compunction at all about bringing up, as forcefully as I possibly can, what I consider to be inadequate representation of Hispanic-Americans. I apologize to no one for what I said.

MR. BENITEZ: It is a problem where there is no immediate solution. As you and I are aware, a national marketing and recruitment plan with aggressive goals was developed through the National Association of Hispanic Federal Executives. We are, therefore, doing something about underrepresentation. I don't want anyone to think we are dismissing the issue here. I think all of the panelists said similar things—that we're going to balance the workforce and that we're going to include Hispanics.

MR. UNGAR: As the moderator, I'm going to exercise the privilege of having the last word. Underrepresentation is a serious problem but that fact does not detract from the important contributions this panel made in addressing diversity issues. I thank the panel for those contributions and now turn the program back to Evangeline Swift.

MS. SWIFT: Thank you Bernie. I'm sorry to see this exchange cut off so shortly but we do have a tight schedule. However, let me say that the

reason we have breakout sessions scheduled for this afternoon is because we were determined to set aside the time to capture the ideas of those of you in the audience. Any one of you could just as easily be up here on the podium, as Mr. Worden said. We at the Board were merely acting as catalysts by putting together this program and these panels. We have set aside considerable time for the breakout sessions and we look forward to, and intend to publish, the comments you make during those sessions. We'll now break for a very short lunch.



Session II: Implementing Diversity Programs in Federal Agencies

Moderator:

Jessica L. Parks
Merit Systems Protection Board

Presenters:

Darlene Floyd
Internal Revenue Service

Alvin Ray
Federal Aviation Administration

C. Shannon Roberts
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Eduardo S. Rodela
Environmental Protection Agency

INTRODUCTION

MS. SWIFT: This afternoon, I am pleased to have a panel that our Member is chairing that will outline successes and failures in implementing a diversity program. Now, may I present to you the Member of our Board, Jessica Parks.

MS. PARKS: Thanks, Van, for introducing me, and thanks also to you and your staff in the Office of Policy and Evaluation for all the hard work that has been involved in putting this important program together for the Board.

This is really an exciting panel for me to chair this afternoon. I think it might be subtitled, "Where the Rubber Hits the Road," for we are going to be hearing from Government managers who have tackled issues that we all face in one form or another.

Implementing diversity programs interests me particularly because it is related closely to one of my strongest beliefs about the Government as an employer. I think that many injustices and unnecessary costs in the Federal workplace could be avoided if managers focused on the results they want and getting the job done, rather than concentrating on keeping the process within old and familiar limits.

The Board's recent study on the glass ceiling for women employed in the Federal Government showed that erroneous perceptions and old habits of thought stand in the way of the best use of the Government's female employees. Our study on work and family responsibilities showed that the Government has been too slow to recognize that flexibilities, such as those in work hours, workplace, and use of leave, can benefit its employees without damaging the effectiveness of the

workforce. I strongly feel that if we concentrate on the results of what we are doing, we will not need to be afraid of doing things in a different way to achieve those results. Keeping our eye on results and a common goal will help us get past the differences that divide us.

And we can go a step further. Not only is it true that flexibility and diversity don't need to interfere with our mission. They can actually help us accomplish it. One of our morning speakers emphasized how a diverse workforce can enhance results and productivity. It was so inspiring to hear some concrete examples of how that can work.

I got the idea that developed into this symposium last fall in St. Louis when I heard Alvin Ray, who is on our panel today, and his colleagues from the Federal Aviation Administration speak on FAA's diversity program in the Great Lakes Region. That presentation was refreshing. It described a distinctive organizational culture, and it was thoroughly candid in identifying what did not work as well as what did. I was so impressed that I thought FAA's story should be widely shared with other agencies.

By the way, that experience in St. Louis confirmed my belief that there is no substitute for getting outside the Beltway and into other parts of the country, where Government is actually delivered to the people and where Government managers and employees have to be creative in coming up with ways to deliver it. The three of us who are members of the Board at MSPB certainly have plenty to keep us busy here in Washington. As you already heard from our Chairman this morning, we do review and issue about 2,000 individual case decisions a year, and each one of us votes on every one of those cases. It is not easy to get away, but keeping in touch with our own regional offices, and with the Government agencies in those regions, has been invaluable both as a source of ideas for us and as a reality check. That is because there probably is not one single, best way of managing every part of Government service, just as there probably is not one single, best way of managing diversity.

After I heard FAA's story in St. Louis, it occurred to me that other agencies must have come up with creative approaches to these issues that we

do not know about, until we hear from a group like this. This symposium is the result. We at MSPB hope to be facilitators for change in this area by publishing the proceedings of this meeting, to provide ideas for other agencies to implement.

This meeting could not have come at a better time. We are witnessing a new administration taking its place under the leadership of a President committed to making the Government look like America. Some Government offices and agencies already have that look, and some understand the strength of that development, but not all are at the same point in their thinking.

There are good reasons why there is no standard definition of diversity and no standard approach to dealing with it. The reasons include the fact that organizational culture is real. You are going to hear something about that this afternoon, from the four agencies represented on this panel. Different organizations truly have different cultures. They have different mixes of people in their workforce. They have different missions, and they have different needs for skills that may affect the makeup of that workforce. And they have paid different degrees of attention to solving the problems of diversity and capitalizing on its strengths.

Something else you are going to hear about this afternoon from these panelists is, managing diversity is not a single action; it is a process. It is not something you can put on your action plan in October and find that you concluded it in January, and then forget about it. It comes in stages. Each stage has its particular characteristics and problems, all of which are affected by each particular organization's culture and resources.

If you are trying to create diversity in a homogeneous workforce, you will first need to recruit employees and orient them and their peers to one another and to your organization. If you already have a diverse workforce, or if you cannot hire right now, which may be the case with most of us soon, you may concentrate on establishing career paths for groups underrepresented in some occupations. If your workforce is stable and you have no underrepresentation in any major occupational level, you may be concentrating on promoting efficient interaction among diverse groups of employees.

For some agencies, managing diversity means attracting employees of all backgrounds to the workforce. For others, it is strategic planning or career development, including succession planning. Some see it as a facet of total quality management. It should not be a surprise that when the topic is diversity, the approaches to it are diverse.

I have asked our panelists to present their agencies' approaches to managing diversity from a nuts-and-bolts perspective. Some are at the planning stage, but there are certainly nuts and bolts in planning, as there are in any activity. I have invited each of them to tell you the details of what they are doing and to give you examples of dead ends as well as successful efforts.

We have a distinguished group of panelists with us. Because we are so interested in what they have to say, I am going to save time by letting you read about them yourselves in their biographies, which are printed in the program. Also in the interest of time, I am going to ask you to save your comments and questions until the end of this session, and we will definitely allow time for questions. So you may want to be thinking of those as you listen to our speakers.

I want to briefly introduce the members of our panel. First, I want to note that John Kusano, listed on the program, is ill today and could not make it, and we are sorry for that. We do have with us Darlene Floyd, Diversity Officer for the Internal Revenue Service; following her is Eduardo Rodela, who is Hispanic Programs Coordinator at the Environmental Protection Agency; next we have Shannon Roberts, Assistant to the Associate Administrator, Office of Space Flight, at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and last, we have Alvin Ray, Manager of the Human Resource Management Division, Great Lakes Region of the FAA, who started it all by fueling my interest in this topic.

We are going to start with Darlene Floyd, who is going to tell us about what IRS has been doing on the topic of diversity. Thank you.

PANEL PRESENTATIONS

MS. FLOYD: Thanks, Jessica. I collect poems and statements. I would like to read to you one that truly captures what we believe at IRS: "One of the prerequisites of progress for any organization is diversity. New possibilities emerge as a result of this confluence of diverse ideas, materials, and people."



IRS' Strategic Plan for Diversity

IRS is engaged in the strategic management process. We look 5 to 10 years down the road and plan what we intend to do as an organization. We have articulated five strategies for change, which we believe will help us get to the future. One of those strategies is Diversity.

We started the first major diversity effort in 1988, when our Senior Deputy Commissioner approved the IRS's strategic initiative on women and minorities. The focus of the initiative was to look at the glass ceiling for women and minorities in our organization at grades 13 to 15. Additionally, it focused on the recruitment, development, advancement, and retention of women and minorities in those grades and management's accountability for helping to provide developmental opportunities for individuals in those grade levels.

We have a strategic plan for diversity in IRS, which is a part of our overall strategic plan. When we developed the strategy, we solicited input from individuals all over our organization, including the National Treasury Employees Union. The strategy focuses on two issues: internal and external diversity issues. As you well know, the taxpaying public is quite diverse. IRS must be able to provide products and services that meet the needs of the diverse public. We must also be able to reach the public that we have not been reaching to ensure voluntary compliance. In order to do that, we considered barriers, like language, and what, when, where, and how we do business. Our services must present options so that we can reach all of the public.

Internally, we have defined diversity very broadly. We believe that diversity includes everyone; the philosophy is one of inclusion. No one is left out. Everyone is different, but each person's different perspectives, talents, and ideas should be used so that IRS can become an employer of choice.

Implementing the Diversity Strategy

IRS has taken a very methodical approach to implementing our Diversity Strategy. First, the

Deputy Commissioner appointed an Executive Diversity Sponsor Group. The group is made up of our Compliance 2000 executive; the president of the National Treasury Employees Union; the Assistant Commissioners for Equal Opportunity, Public Affairs, Human Resources, and Taxpayer Services; and the Regional Commissioner, Central Region. The group provides leadership to the organization, in terms of where IRS needs to be with respect to diversity. Members talk about the internal and external issues IRS has to deal with and come up with strategic plans to push diversity forward.

Our second step will be to look at what private industry and other Government agencies have done and to benchmark those companies and agencies. We will look at companies that have ongoing diversity programs, like DuPont, Motorola, Apple Computer, and AT&T. We will ask them about their successes and their failures, and about what it is that they have done that would work for us.

We are also working on having a vision statement so that everyone in our organization is "singing from the same hymnal." An outside consultant will work with our executive committee and senior staff to frame that vision. One of the foundations of our diversity program is that we all should have the same concepts, the same philosophy, of what diversity is about in our organization.

Further, we decided to train key individuals throughout the organization. We have seven regions across the Nation. We thought that we needed to identify key people in all of our offices who would be able to advise, consult, and give direction to our office heads. We have chosen a cross-section of individuals to train. All are managers, including EEO managers, human resource chiefs, and public affairs officers. We are considering National Treasury Employee Union local representatives also. These individuals will lead when we begin to implement our Diversity Strategy. They will be trained in such issues as looking at IRS processes and systems to see if they truly value and manage diversity. If these processes and systems don't support the strategy, these individuals will advise us on what to do about it.

Next, we will do diagnostic research, to establish a baseline for IRS. We will look at policies, practices, and systems to find if they indeed help IRS effectively manage diversity. We are committed to effecting a culture change. To do that, we have to look at our organization's roots.

We will also develop a curriculum on diversity. Our local offices are presently doing diversity training, which includes using outside sources as well as those developed in-house. As one of our Nationwide training efforts, we have given all of our managers a book called "Workforce America," by Marilyn Loden and Judith Rosener.

We also conduct a management symposium each year, where all of our managers come together and talk about "hot issues." Diversity has been one of the "hot issues" for the last 2 years.

We believe we must take a global approach to diversity, a holistic approach, and look at what needs to be changed in IRS to effectively manage diversity. But you cannot change behavior and systems without first looking at the root causes of them.

MS. PARKS: Thank you, Darlene. I talked to Darlene last week, as I was getting ready for this panel, and the key phrase that stood out was "a global approach, a holistic approach" to diversity. Certainly, in this time when we keep reading about reinventing government, this approach is the most appropriate. It is also important, as Darlene said, to focus on external demands and approaches. Too often, we look only within the agency, at how we are reacting with each other, and forget that most of us are in a service field. Being in Government service, we need to look at who it is we are serving. Another interesting point Darlene brought up was about the broad-based executive sponsor group. As the morning panel emphasized, we need leadership, not only at the top but from different areas. Darlene gave some examples of the kinds of people and backgrounds you can pull together to be sponsors so that support is not coming from just one direction.

Our next Speaker is Eduardo Rodela, from the Environmental Protection Agency.

MR. RODELA: Thank you.

Introduction

Imagine, if you will, a big stage where people are trying to coordinate a big production. The stage for this illustration is EPA's Headquarters Office, where there are different players with different scripts. All the players, about 6,000 plus, bring with them personal and work experiences that influence their assigned scripts. They bring these values to an agency that also has a set of values and expectations. The goal becomes one of integrating these different values and expectations into one coherent whole.

It is important to remember that cultural diversity is about workforce inclusion. Each individual or his or her referent group is on a stage, so to speak. But not everyone is on the main stage; some are off on corner stages. Each person is seeking to make a contribution to the play; each one eagerly makes an effort to understand the script he or she has been handed and how the scripts all fit together. If we do not recognize the players, as persons or referent groups, at an organizational or societal level, they will eventually do their own thing. Whether their own thing is being coordinated into the major production is another question. They may eventually pattern their own scripts and their own plays. Therefore, our challenge is to know how to bring all of these differences together in support of the major production.

Aligning EPA's Systems and Goals

At the organizational level, the challenges are to ensure that various groups are appropriately represented in the workforce and are acknowledged for their contributions via an objective performance management system that is work-behavior oriented. The purpose of such a system is to reduce the subjectivity that has the tendency to influence performance appraisal outcomes. We all have our preferences. There are many ways to accomplish our work tasks; the important thing is that the tasks are accomplished. Our personal way is not necessarily the best way. We will determine our effectiveness by what the customer

tells us about our work services or products. We also need reward systems that enhance and support individual and work group performance. How can we speak about cooperation and commitment when our rewards encourage and support strong competition among those whom we want to cooperate with? Our organizational systems have to be aligned with our mission and goals.

One approach to valuing workforce diversity is to include people in the organization's decision-making process. Inclusion means increasing self-control in the workplace. Another illustrative term may be responsibility. Inclusion is not saying, "I am flexible and I am going to do my own thing." No. Rather, it is saying, "I know our mission. I know our goals. I understand what my responsibilities are in the problem-solving process." We are not cutting the pie and giving it away. We are expanding its size. This is the purpose of the inclusion principle.

Becoming Informed About Diversity

EPA has a task force that was tasked, by the Deputy Administrator, to identify and look at the issues relating to cultural diversity. The task force created four subgroups to look at both internal and external workforce issues and practices. One work group was the best practices group, whose task was to go out and talk to private and public sector organizations and learn about other organizational programs and experiences on diversity.

The second group was a training work group, which looked at the most current diversity training courses. It also conducted a self-assessment of programs and courses in place at EPA. We were able to step back, and with a new perspective, understand our current diversity practices.

The third was an employees survey work group. The group was tasked to gather information on employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors concerned with workforce diversity.

Lastly, there was a data analysis work group that studies EPA personnel actions.

Employee Survey Findings

Training Practices. Data on training practices at EPA showed that most employees believe they have adequate training opportunities for their jobs, but employees want EPA training to be more sensitive to the existing cultural diversity. I believe that the agency does not have a detailed tracking system for training. If we were to look at training from a discrimination point of view, we may not know where all of the training monies are being spent.

Recruitment and Promotions. Most employees say that EPA has a good record in recruiting women. Less than half say job competition is fair and open, a negative perception shared mostly by women and minorities. It is partly explained by the belief that informal procedures exist which prevent equitable recruitment. Employees believe that whites will hire whites, women will hire women, and so on. I recommend that we look into creating recruitment panels comprised of diverse individuals. I think that minorities and women can compete in this scenario.

Promotions. Seventy-seven percent of the staff have been promoted at EPA. However, 70 percent of our respondents say that promotions past the GS/GM-13 level are not equitable. The perception of a glass ceiling is prevalent among women and minorities.

Professional/support relations. Half of our respondents perceive that conflict exists between our professional and support staff. Such conflicts may result from the need to rescript support staff jobs. New technologies, computers, and word-processing programs have altered older work duty assignments. We have not finished assessing the data to determine other possible explanations for these conflicts.

Incentives and reinforcements. Despite the fact that EPA rewards 89 percent of its employees, more than half are dissatisfied with the recognition they have received. We believe this dissatisfaction is grounded in a general perception that awards are often determined by favoritism.

Accountability. Almost half of our respondents believe that the performance appraisal system is fair. However, a little over half say they do not get useful feedback on their performance on a regular basis. There are questions pertaining to the differences between procedural versus distributive justice with regard to the performance management system.

Findings on Best Practices

The best practices work group found that inclusion sets a strong foundation for diversity strategies. In a very related sense, Edward Lawler argues that the present business environment, level of education of the workforce, and methods of doing work require greater employee participation. The way to increase employee participation is to move ability to influence workplace decisions, organizational rewards, work-related and other pertinent information, and knowledge and skills about the work to the lowest levels in the organization. To do this, we need a clearly articulated vision and mission for the organization, policies and practices that enhance cooperation, clear goals, and management accountability.

Along with accountability among managers, we also need their commitment. They influence the overall direction of the organization. Our visits to different organizations tell us that commitment among managers is generated by having them become involved in changing the organization. Managers can influence organizational change by learning and participating in training and by orchestrating or coordinating diversity projects. Involve the manager in the diversity effort. Many of you have heard the saying, "To teach is to learn." This is the type of commitment that will move the organization forward.

Conclusions

Resources will have to be used to develop successful programs. EPA spent a good chunk of money to conduct focus groups and the employee survey. Some of these funds were obtained from program directors by the Deputy of the Office of Human Resources, who is the chair of the task

force. It is difficult to put on a theatrical production without resources. Think of the sets, the highly trained players, and the accompanying staff and others. Valuing diversity is no different. As EPA moves forward with this initiative, it begins to realize the relationship between workforce diversity, total quality management, and autonomous work groups. We can see the strong connection between tasks and workflows, the interaction among people as they perform their work, and the need to establish structures to guide all of these workplace actors.

Thank you.

MS. PARKS: Thank you so much, Dr. Rodela.

I want to remark at this point that part of what we are doing today is networking. You may not have much time to talk with each other here today, but you have a list of attendees, and you can contact each other. I am sure our panelists would be happy to receive a phone call from you for followup information because they have so much detail to share.

I have to note, too, that Dr. Rodela and Darlene Floyd had not met before today. As they spoke, I wrote down key words and found that their agencies' approaches to diversity were certainly different. But it is amazing how many key words kept coming up in both presentations. "Inclusion" has been mentioned again and again. Inclusion means getting past race, ethnicity, and gender. Inclusion applies to managers, supervisors, support staff, and union and nonunion officials. It is striking that when we talk about diversity in diverse situations, we see similarities in what works.

At this point, I want to turn the program over to Shannon Roberts, who comes to us from NASA.

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Definitions and Concepts

The following definitions are used at NASA to distinguish among equal opportunity, affirmative action, and valuing and managing diversity:

Equal opportunity. Colorblind treatment of everyone, based on merit, and regardless of race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, or disability.

Affirmative action. Preferential treatment of the targeted groups to correct for past and current discrimination.

Valuing and managing diversity. More effective work with a workforce that is becoming more diverse and aware of culture, race, color, ethnicity, gender, age, national origin, physical ability, religion, socioeconomic levels, language, sexual orientation, politics, organizational philosophy, intelligence, occupation skills, and attitudes.

These definitions, which appeared in the Winter 1991-1992 issue of *The Bureaucrat*, were formulated by Dr. Harriett Jenkins and Mr. James R. Carr. Dr. Jenkins is the former Associate Administrator for Equal Opportunity at NASA and is the current director of the U.S. Senate Fair Employment Practices Office.

NASA also uses the following conceptual framework, which was developed by Byron Kunisawa, a consultant to NASA, as it relates to affirmative action, multiculturalism, and workforce diversity:

Affirmative action. The model is intervention, the issue is discrimination, and the goal is parity for affected groups.

Multiculturalism. The model is an umbrella, the issue is exclusion, and the goal is systems change for affected groups.

Workforce diversity. The model is education, the issue is illiteracy, and the goal is literacy for both groups and individuals.

Equal opportunity and affirmative action are still important in dealing with discrimination and mistrust. However, we need to perceive of diversity as value added, strategically planned for, and characterized by increased cooperation among diverse individuals and groups.

NASA's Vision for Diversity

The earlier presenters emphasized the need for an agency vision, a strategy for what you are going to do to make a difference to your workforce. NASA's vision and goals for diversity recognize the relationship between its workforce and the accomplishment of its mission.

With respect to workforce composition, women make up 30 percent of NASA's total workforce. Minorities, including women, comprise 24 percent of the workforce. While we have made some strides in certain groups, we certainly have an opportunity to improve in others and to take a more strategic approach to diversity and multiculturalism.

NASA's Cultural Climate and Practices Review

A strategic step towards gaining an appreciation of the cultural climate and practices of NASA and opportunities for improvement was taken by then-Administrator Truly in February 1991. In response to concerns expressed by an employee group at one of the NASA centers, he appointed a team headed by General Elmer Brooks, Deputy Administrator for Management Systems and Facilities at NASA, to review the NASA centers. Administrator Truly asked the group to:

- Determine the prevailing attitudes and receptivity of the workforce towards cultural diversity and fair and equitable treatment in the workforce;
- Review the status of minority and female employees and individuals with disabilities relative to the rest of the workforce, identifying pertinent symptoms and trends;
- Identify internal policies or management practices which have, or are perceived to have, positive or adverse effects on any group;

- Brief the findings and observations, conclusions and recommendations to the Administrator, Center Director, and pertinent NASA Associate Administrator at the conclusion of each center visit.

This effort was subsequently endorsed and continued by the current NASA Administrator, Dan Goldin, who is a strong proponent of workforce diversity. The effort has been a significant revelation to us.

The seven-person team, of which I was a member, reviewed relevant data for each center; met with the Center Director and Senior Management Council; held individual meetings with selected center officials such as the EEO Officer, the Personnel Director, and union representatives; held group discussions with integral work units and employee advisory groups; and met with individual employees on a voluntary basis. Each center visit took 3 to 4 days. During the past 2 years, the NASA Culture Review and Practices Team has visited all of the NASA centers and spoken with over 1,200 individuals out of the 25,000 employees.

One of the major outcomes of the team's visit is the compilation of what the centers and the team members believe are the "best practices" for diversity and multiculturalism that we can share with NASA's 10 centers and headquarters. Among those identified to date are: master action plan for diversity, multicultural leadership councils, employee advisory groups, regular senior management meetings with advisory groups, mentoring programs, visible role models, executive assistant rotational programs, promotion of a team culture and multiple recognition strategies, time-in-grade reviews, and career development strategies (individual development plans, succession planning, job rotations). Also included are multicultural, human element, coaching, and sexual harassment training for all employees; periodic "diversity health" reviews of the work environment (old boy/girl networks, cronyism, nepotism, time-in-grade, awards, special assignments), diverse representative

recruitment and community outreach initiatives; use of COOP¹² and special intern programs as feeder sources; incorporation of diversity values in the strategic plan; value and positive recognition for risk-taking behaviors; flexitime and flexible family care leave programs; implementation of total quality management principles and practices; and consideration of supplier diversity practices.

Recommended Approaches to Diversity

From NASA's experience and the review of this team, I suggest that following are key to any agency's success in approaching diversity:

- Top management leadership, support, and "walking the talk" behavior;
- Development of a multicultural strategic plan;
- Evolution from cultural competency, where the employees have read relevant literature and received training in diversity, to cultural literacy, where employees are able to "read" the culture through situations and interactions; and
- Integration of multiculturalism into the agency's day-to-day business practices to where it is the "norm" rather than the "new" way of managing.

MS. PARKS: Thanks, Shannon, so much. Again, I cannot help but notice common threads. In preparation for this symposium, I talked to a number of people in different agencies to try to learn more about how they dealt with this process. I often got corrected when I used the term "diversity." Although we still tend to use that term more often than not, the preferred word for a lot of people was "inclusion."

I thought it was notable that Shannon mentioned something that also is a theme of our previous speakers. Management leadership throughout all levels of the agency is very important for the success of this process.

¹² Cooperative education.

The next speaker is Alvin Ray from the FAA. As I mentioned earlier, I heard Alvin and his colleagues talk about the FAA's diversity program in the Great Lakes Region. What struck me in their presentation was that their program originated at a regional office, not at headquarters. I would like to remind everybody, and certainly people here in Washington, about how much we can learn from our regional or field offices. Having served in them myself, I have an appreciation of their innovative energy. With that, I would like to turn it over to Mr. Ray.

MR. RAY: Thank you.

Introduction

Jessica has requested that we talk about our failures as well as successes we've gone through on our diversity initiative. But it is hard for me to talk about our failures because we have changed the process so much since we started.

We are very fortunate in the Great Lakes Region that we had the opportunity to fail so many times before we found where we should go. That is a key point because one thing we came to realize is that managing diversity is a long-term commitment that requires dedication, if you plan to make an impact.

Knowing What is Going On in Your Agency

Our diversity initiative started back in the mid-1980's, when we found that we were losing so many of our developmental controllers. In one of our facilities, for example, it was normal to lose up to 60 percent of a class from initial hire to full development. The region had several hundred controllers in developmental positions at that time, and we realized that something had to be done if we were to accomplish our mission. So we started to look at some of the reasons we were not retaining our employees.

In 1988, the House Subcommittee on Government Operations conducted some hearings in Chicago and looked at discrimination in the FAA. They chose O'Hare Air Traffic Control Tower as an example. We watched for days as employees, especially women and people of color, paraded before that committee and talked about some

of the horrors that they experienced on the job. We realized then that we had to make a very firm commitment to do something about discrimination.

We have a white-male dominated workforce. It is a highly technical workforce, a very macho workforce, that has a very specific image of what an air traffic controller should look like: how tall an individual should be, what sex, what color hair, how they walk. Even if you were a white male, if you did not fit that particular image—and people of color and women, of course, could not fit it—you had a problem.

Deciding to Value Diversity

In attempting to solve it, we have come to a realization of what our effort should be about. We look at valuing diversity as really enhancing relationships among all our employees on the job; actually dealing with attitudes, feelings, and beliefs that lead to sexism, racism, and discrimination, including discrimination based upon sexual orientation. We have also broadened our definition of diversity to include ethnic identity because in some of the areas where we started to deal with issues related to women and people of color, we found simmering underneath some very debilitating ethnic issues.

How the FAA Manages Diversity

We define managing diversity very broadly; it is looking at what a hostile environment is and how we can deal with it. It means managers actually create a work environment that is supportive of all people, where everyone and anyone can contribute.

We have used systems reviews, training, and several other tools to move forward in managing diversity.

Reviewing systems. When we started looking at how to manage diversity, we first reviewed our current personnel programs and identified those program areas that we believed were critical to our diversity initiative. We found that in order for us to be effective, we had to go back and look at how all our personnel systems interrelate, as far as producing and retaining a diverse

workforce. For example, we have had an affirmative action program for some time. It has been effective in the recruitment area but certainly not in the retention area. So we had to look at what was happening with some of our recruitment and affirmative action efforts to see how we could retain more employees. We looked at training as a tool to change attitudes and beliefs, and we looked at how we provided developmental opportunities to our women and people of color employees. We looked at alternate work schedules or flexitime as they relate to work and family life programs, such as child care. We looked at shift work. Many of our facilities operate 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, so we had to look at how these types of operations affect our employees.

Training. After we reviewed our personnel systems, we developed a very comprehensive initiative for managing diversity, covering our employees from prehire orientation to retirement. In this initiative, we zeroed in on training, because we believe that training is a means of bringing about change. Through training, we have sensitized people to value each others' differences and appropriately deal with differing attitudes and perceptions.

One of the training programs we developed was a 3-day experiential cultural diversity workshop, which deals with feelings, issues, attitudes, and perceptions about women and people of color. It deals with sexual harassment, discrimination, and racism issues. The workshop is a very intense and painful process where participants are sensitized to the feelings and attitudes of others. We believed and still believe that it is necessary to have an experiential type training in order for people to get in touch with their attitudes and beliefs, to heighten their awareness and sensitivities to people different from themselves.

One of the things that we attempt to impress upon people during the workshop is that racism and sexism are a part of our culture, and no one is immune from them. For example, I had to get in touch with my own internalized racism in order to begin to understand and deal with and relate to other's racism. It is not just a white male issue; it is an issue for all of us. One of the problems we have had—that we are still trying to find a solution to—is the fact that there is so much denial where racism and sexism are concerned,

and that this denial exists at all levels of the organization. First of all, there is denial that the problems exist. Then once there is acknowledgment that they do exist, there is denial that they exist in my specific organization. It is always somebody else who has the problem.

Our 3-day workshop is conducted by a consultant, with assistance from an organizational development specialist and other employees who have been trained to be facilitators. We found that it is important to have someone from outside conduct the workshops because of the sensitive issues and the complex interrelationships that arise during the workshops.

Overall, we have trained about 1,000 of our 7,000-plus employees through our 3-day workshop and many of them are forming a core of people who are active supporters of our goals.

We are also developing a 2-day experiential cultural diversity workshop, which we will prototype in March 1993. We will use our own people in conducting this workshop because, now that this effort has taken hold, we have a mandate from our headquarters that every region will provide some experiential training to all the supervisors and managers by the end of fiscal year 1994. Because of the cost, we cannot afford to have an outsider conduct these 2-day workshops.

We have made a very concentrated effort at the Chicago enroute traffic control center, in Aurora, IL, a center of about 700 to 800 employees, 600 of whom are controllers. Half of the employees there have gone through the 3-day workshop, and we have reached a point where employees themselves conduct 1-day workshops and deal with diversity issues at the worksite.

We visited Aurora a few weeks ago, and talked to a group of women who are frustrated because they cannot seem to completely resolve the problem of sexual harassment. Before, sexual harassment was very overt, but now it is more subtle. The women said that this is a change, because now no one would dare do something overt since there are enough employees—and not just women, but white males and others—who have been through the workshop and are more attuned to the problem.

This group of employees decided to control their work environment and to make a difference. They designed buttons to wear to identify supporters of these efforts. I told them, "This is great progress, because now you can change your work environment. Of course, we are going to continue giving you support, but the fact that you want to make a difference, and you are doing something about it, is really remarkable from where we were 2 years ago."

And most impressively, they developed a 1-day awareness symposium, which they run as an open forum. Any employee can come to the symposium and talk to another employee who has been through the workshop. Employees who want to learn about our diversity initiative can come and talk to their peers. This symposium has helped dissipate a lot of employee resistance to our diversity initiative.

That is a great point for us to reach, although it is happening only in one of our major facilities. It has taken us a great deal of effort and resources to reach that point. But now employees from other facilities, are calling employees at the Chicago center to find out, "What's going on? We hear how things have changed. Can you come down here and give us some assistance?"

Followthrough support. In addition to training, we found that we needed a followthrough support program in order to address the issues that were coming up as employees become more sensitized to workforce diversity. They needed skills to deal with these problems, so we started various skills training as followup.

Team building workshops for supervisors. We started team building among supervisors at some of our facilities around diversity issues, like race and gender. However, we found, after a few team building workshops, that the supervisors, were unable to deal with the gender and race issues because there were other underlying issues. For example, there were ethnic issues and religious issues that we had not thought about that had to be addressed. So we backed off and started a much broader approach to team building.

Mentoring. We also started a mentorship program where employees serve as mentors to our new hires and developmental employees. At first we started it with women and people of color, and then the white male trainees decided they wanted it, too. They needed it, so we broadened it to include all employees.

Leadership development. We conducted leadership training, providing employees with the skills to create support groups and establish networking groups. We recently finished training about 30 employees who will help us form support groups and networks, especially among women. We have reached the point where some of our employees are beginning to identify issues and tell us what they need. That is another sign, I think, of the progress we are making.

Marketing and education. As I said, our managing diversity initiative is a comprehensive effort. At one point, we decided to start more marketing and education efforts. We began getting complaints from white males who said that women and people of color were getting all the jobs and all the promotions even though the statistics showed differently. People did not believe the statistics. I guess they thought we were making them up. We had to start to address the backlash, so we began listening sessions, where we sit down with groups of employees and listen to their concerns. In turn, we tell them what we wanted to accomplish with our diversity initiatives and how to deal with their concerns.

During our new-employee orientations we tell the new hires the importance of workforce diversity to the FAA's mission. We give them a picture of what our culture looks like in different parts of the region, so that there will be no surprises.

We also realized that managers needed skills. They needed to exhibit behaviors that support workforce diversity and they needed to be able to intercede and resolve issues as they occur. So we gave them the training that would help them.

Progress assessment. We have developed evaluation tools to assess our progress. Our tools include surveys conducted before and after the

workshops to assess the effectiveness of our programs. We have modified the survey to look at what employees feel about their work, work environment, and work culture. We have also used exit interviews and listening sessions to assess our progress. Our headquarters office is also in the process of developing some instruments for assessing what the work environment is like right now so we can track what is happening.

Conclusions

Managing diversity is good business. For example, we have started looking at how our employees relate to the aviation community. How do our male controllers deal with female pilots? We have had some complaints from female pilots about how they have been treated or accepted as pilots by our male controllers. On a related matter, our female controllers have had problems dealing with the pilots. And our female aviation safety inspectors have had problems dealing with the aviation community.

One important thing we found in the whole process is, we get sidetracked very easily. We can get so involved in training that we devote all of our resources and efforts to training and forget that that is not the only issue. There is one issue, and that is changing the culture. That is what makes all the difference. We find that as we progress toward making that change, a lot of other things just begin to naturally happen. Not only do we get support from management, but we get support from the union and employees. People begin to identify the issues that we would never see, and they come up with proposals to solve them. So we have to keep in mind that changing the culture is what our objective really is. Thank you.

MS. PARKS: Thank you so much, Alvin. Alvin noted that the FAA did not have a big problem with recruitment. The history behind that is something that we at MSPB are very familiar with. What preceded that recruitment effort was a strike of about 10,000 air traffic controllers.

I was an Administrative Judge with MSPB in Atlanta at the time, hearing these cases. It is interesting because that event, which was so traumatic for the country, as well as for the FAA,

turned out to have a positive side. It is unusual for an agency to have openings of that magnitude with which to work on recruitment. It is important to hear of FAA's long-term commitment to recruit a diverse workforce.

Something else Alvin mentioned stuck with me the first time I heard him speak. When I went to hear about diversity, I did not expect to hear about sexual harassment. I think that is just one example of other problems that probably come to the forefront when employees feel there is an open environment in which they can communicate. What is interesting is that the agency hasn't responded by saying, "Wait a minute. That is a different topic. That is not what we are going to talk about." The approach has been to deal with the problems as they come up.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. PARKS: I have one question to get things rolling, and then I will let the audience ask questions. My question is directed at Alvin, but anybody else can respond.

Can you give an example of an unexpected problem that you encountered, which made you shift gears; or an example of some particular failure you encountered along the way? Because we can certainly learn from any mistakes as well.

MR. RAY: We had so many. How do I isolate them? Let me think for a minute.

MS. PARKS: You want to think on that one? Then let's take a question from the audience.

MR. MARK ROTH (American Federation of Government Employees): I was very appreciative of Ms. Floyd's and several other speakers' comments about the importance of bringing in the union into diversity initiatives. Our union is very supportive of what you are trying to do, but I don't see how you can accomplish what you want to do without union involvement where there are unions. As far as the union's rights and responsibilities are concerned, most of the things you want to accomplish have to do with working conditions. Therefore, if unions are not brought in as "owners and partners" of the program, as IRS is doing, how can you succeed? And why,

with so many of the speakers, has union involvement been almost like an afterthought? Is it just because I am from a different audience that I'm the minority today?

MR. RAY: I did not make a big issue of it because the union was involved from the beginning in what we were doing. It was essential. Wherever we had a problem with the union, we had to stop and backtrack and then find a way to include it in what we wanted to do. For example, some of the facilitators at our workshops are union representatives.

Let me now address Jessica's question about unexpected problems. One oversight we made when we started the mentor program was not including first-line supervisors in the planning and implementation of the program. Because of it, nothing happened in the beginning and there were all kinds of little problems we could not explain. We later found that first-line supervisors resisted the effort because they felt threatened. First of all, unknowingly, we had given the impression we were judging them as being ineffective supervisors because we were saying mentors were needed. They perceived this as taking away part of their responsibilities. So then we had to really backtrack and get them involved. The union had been very involved in the mentorship effort but we had just forgotten about first-line supervisors.

MS. PARKS: I would like to follow up on the union question. I am curious to know if anybody had run into problems because of an unanticipated effect of your diversity initiative on labor-management relations. How did you deal with it?

MR. RODELA: When the task force was set up at EPA, the representatives from the unions were invited, and they became members. They gave us feedback on issues that concerned them. I think, if anything, they have been pleased with being involved in the process and with the potential changes or contributions that they can make.

MS. DORA ALCALA (Department of the Air Force): Since we are here to discuss cultural diversity and maybe educate each other on

terminology, definitions, et cetera, I could not help but notice, Mr. Ray, as you were doing your presentation, that you used the term "women and people of color."

I think that since we have so many groups, we should think about everybody's sensitivities. I think perhaps instead of saying "women and people of color," we might say, "women, minorities, and people with disabilities."

MR. RAY: The term "women and people of color" evolved from the Great Lakes Region. The people who were involved in the effort decided to use those terms in a general sense.

MS. ALCALA: Just internally within your agency?

MR. RAY: Just within the region. I don't know if the whole agency is going to use the terms or not. The FAA's diversity manager can decide on that. I know definitely there are regions in the FAA that do not use those terms. But for some reason, in the Midwest, they have caught on, and they are used very extensively in our area.

MS. SWIFT: Mr. Ray, how long has this project been going on? The FAA appears to be further along than some others who are still in the planning stage. You are actually in the business of changing the culture of your organization.

Also, wherever I go, I notice that people really do not discuss race. Even if you go to a training session, and everyone is an SES employee, you still have people shrinking from discussing the issue. Do you believe you have overcome this, and if so, how?

MR. RAY: First of all, we found that the lower in the organizational structure we went, the more open people were in discussing race. But once we got to the regional office and started to deal with regional officials, there was more reluctance to discuss it. We found that the more people experienced our 3-day workshop, the more open they become.

MS. SWIFT: So you started from below?

MR. RAY: Yes, we did. We did not have the support of the regional management team initially. It was not until 1991, when the regional management team took the 3-day workshop together, that we got their support. Then things sort of took off and opened up.

Not getting their support originally was a mistake we made, but we could not do any better than we did because nobody would talk to us about diversity. At that time, I was the civil rights officer, and I talked to the manager of the air traffic division about retaining more controllers. He had a real problem, so he was willing to commit his organization to doing something. Plus, we had the House hearings, which helped too.

So our efforts grew gradually. Now we are very open. We don't seem to mind talking about race and racial issues.

MS. SWIFT: This has been going on for 5 years, since 1987?

MR. RAY: Yes, but very slowly and then gradually.

MS. ANNA MARIA FARIAS (Department of Labor): In the last 8 years, I have had the privilege of working for two Cabinet secretaries. I observed that it is not enough for a department head to say, "This is going to happen. We are going to have a greater percentage of Hispanics or blacks." When the order gets down to the managers, it is not enthusiastically being carried out.

A significant part of the problem, to my mind, is that managers do not always understand the issues of diversity and fail to follow through.

MS. PARKS: Just to sum up, I'll remind you of a couple of buzzwords from our panel. Inclusion is a word you hear repeatedly, and I think it is used in the broadest possible sense; not just inclusion of both genders, and different ethnic backgrounds and races, but inclusion of all levels of management, all levels of supervision, and every level of employee. If you do not have that, as Ms. Farias just said, your diversity initiative will not succeed.

Change, too, is an obvious buzzword, but not just change as a single event. We have heard about change as an ongoing process. We have seen good examples that show that you really have to keep a commitment going.

We have also heard from all panelists that some agencies have shown a true responsiveness, not just putting diversity on a chart and saying, "We are going to tackle it this year," as some kind of management objective, but really doing something at each stage of the game.

I want to thank all the panelists. You were terrific. Thank you very much.

MS. SWIFT: After a 10-minute break, please report to the breakout room assigned to you. The breakout sessions are the critical part of the program, and we really want you to talk in your groups about the issues.

Session III: Small Group Discussions

Group Leader:

Paul van Rijn
Merit Systems Protection Board

Participants:

Adalberto Bernal
Department of the Navy

Frank Cipolla
National Academy of Public Administration

Frank Ferris
National Treasury Employees Union

Harriett Jenkins
Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices

Gwen Jones
Federal Aviation Administration

Fran Lopes
Office of Personnel Management

John Moore
Internal Revenue Service

Lucretia Myers
Merit Systems Protection Board

Antonia Nowell
University of the District of Columbia

Alvin Ray
Federal Aviation Administration

C. Shannon Roberts
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Anne Scotton
Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship
Government of Canada



INTRODUCTION

MR. VAN RIJN: Good afternoon. I am Paul van Rijn with the Merit Systems Protection Board. I am going to facilitate this group's discussion. We are taping this session to include it in the final report and we're also taking notes for a summary, which will be presented at the plenary session that will follow.

In this half hour, I would like to try to do two things. First, I'd like to get your reaction, in a very open ended way, to some of the things that you've been hearing today. For example, are there any things that particularly struck you? Second, I'd like to find out where you think we should be going from here. When we go back to our organizations, what should our organizations be doing in terms of managing workforce diversity?

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

MS. LOPES: In his presentation this morning, Don Worden said that he was preaching to the choir. Many at this symposium are in the human resources management arena and EEO arena. Our business is human resources management.

Since there is a major concern about workforce and diversity planning buy-in by managers, the people who do the actual hiring and run the organizations, why is there not a mix of management and/or line management present today? Does MSPB see this symposium as the beginning of a process where it might evolve to that particular stage?

MS. JONES: I have attended a variety of workshops, conferences, and meetings. Generally, the worker bees are there, and they are out of EEO or human resource management. One of my concerns is how to encourage our line managers to accompany us at first, to learn more about diversity. I want them to become comfortable talking about race and other issues. And then to see things on their own so that they become knowledgeable about the issues and develop their own style of managing diversity. Learning about diversity is one aspect of it. The other is to start living it and doing it. Managers are not quite sure what diversity means and what to do with it.

MR. VAN RIJN: All of us here have a pretty good idea about diversity, yet the line managers really ought to also be participating in something like this. Maybe what we need is to conduct a symposium.

sium and invite primarily the line managers. If you invite just line managers, would they know enough about this topic?

MR. BERNAL: Yes, they would. They have received training in this area. For example, we have a committee in Philadelphia that puts on some very successful training for managers from that area. About 600 managers attend on a regular basis every year. It involves training in different areas of human resources and EEO.

One thing that I was thinking about was that, yes, the commitment from top leadership is very important, but Alvin Ray mentioned it is also very important to get the commitment from first-level supervisors. Until you reach those middle managers, you are not going to effect the change that is necessary.

MS. NOWELL: As a public administrator, my concern is with educating future public administrators at the undergraduate and graduate level. The curriculum establishes concepts and issues to be covered, and curriculum development must be open to changes dictated by a dynamic environment. A key question related to diversity is the nature of the knowledge needed to prepare students to successfully manage a diverse workforce.

MR. CIPOLLA: There is a very practical problem when you talk about involving managers. If you talk about managing diversity, you can't really do that with any kind of exactness because organizations frequently do not have diversity. You have to have diversity to really relate to the subject of managing diversity or implementing diversity programs. Managers are still dealing with how to get diversity in their workforce, let alone how to make it work for them or to make their organizations responsive.

MS. SCOTTON: I don't agree that managers have bought in. I think they know the words because we write them for them. Then they say the words, and that is it; they believe that they've done something very special.

In my previous job, where I was responsible for multiculturalizing Federal institutions and agencies in Canada, we did what, effectively, you

have done here today, but with our senior people. For instance, we invited the deputy ministers, who are equivalent to the secretaries of Cabinet departments, and those one level below them. We asked them to present to their colleagues and to their peers their best practices. Yes, we still wrote the presentations, but they had to at least understand what they were presenting. Because they were showcasing their organizations, they were very proud of what they had done or what their organizations had done. It was a little different approach than just bringing in a lot of managers together and lecturing them about diversity.

The other thing that we have done increasingly is to include diversity training in our senior executive training programs. There is a 2-week or 3-week senior executive training session where our executives get involved by conducting the training themselves. They, again, present their best practices.

MR. VAN RIJN: Going back to Frank Cipolla's point, a lot of these managers do not have diversity. Reflecting back to something that we heard this morning: would they know how to get diversity? Are there hindrances? Is their work environment hostile to diversity, so that people are not attracted to working there?

MR. CIPOLLA: They are working on nondiscrimination and affirmative action. And now they have to deal with diversity. That is my main point. The message on dealing with diversity should be different from EEO and affirmative action. It cannot be the same message; it is not going to take. It has to vary from organization to organization, mission to mission, situation to situation, and culture to culture.

MR. MOORE: My business is essentially organizational architecture, the design of organizations to optimize customer value, not workforce diversity. Diversity did not really become clear to me until I saw up there on the chart what I think you all really mean by diversity: "It's the culture, stupid."

When I see it in that light, it becomes clear to me that this is something that has to do not only with organizational values but with individual values,

individual self-interest. As Frank Cipolla said, however you define what it is you are trying to achieve, it has to be in the context of what that organization values. Managers in the private sector or in the public sector are not going to do something they perceive as not in their own self-interest, and the organization is not going to do it unless it believes that it is providing value one way or another.

What I have not seen here today is a clear statement of the value that is produced by inclusion. I believe it is there, but I am concerned. I am in a position where I have to justify sociotechnical systems design to the IRS as actually improving net customer value. It is only by proving the value that they are starting to pay some attention.

I suggest that to really move diversity forward, we have to identify what the organizations will get from having all the different interests represented. Organizations will pay attention when they see something is in their self-interest.

MS. NOWELL: My current research on infant mortality reveals a continuing disproportionate impact on African-Americans and other minorities. A number of the current recommendations promulgated increasingly rely on understanding of cultural differences. The professionals who should meet with more success are those who can place workable solutions within the context of the prevailing cultural norms. In turn, administrators of agencies who intentionally hire a diverse workforce to bring a collective wisdom to bear on problems of their diverse clientele should be more effective.

MR. VAN RIJN: Ronnie Blumenthal mentioned this morning that customers are diverse and that they have diverse interests. We need to have servicing organizations that are diverse so that they can be in tune with their customers.

MS. NOWELL: I agree with Mr. van Rijn. It would help them to mount more workable kinds of initiatives.

MS. LOPES: Can we get back to the corporate culture and where they are in this process? For those organizations that have not pursued affirmative action and do not have diversity, you have to talk to them about who their customers are and

the value of workforce diversity to the customers. They need to know how to create diversity in their workforce. You can call it EEO or affirmative action, but it really is the creation of diversity. The problem is, if you stop at the creation of diversity, you can't talk about understanding and managing it.

I see a link between service delivery and diversity. I agree that organizations will be at different levels of diversity relative to their own corporate culture, but we all have customers, whether we want to admit it or not. We need to talk to those customers. If we begin to look at the Nation and at the business that we are providing, we will find that we are providing a service, a product, to a very diversified Nation. So while Frank says some of them are not even there to talk about managing diversity, why? Then if they are not, let's talk about helping them to get there.

MR. CIPOLLA: That's right. That's what I was trying to relate to the first question that was asked: Why us and not managers? It seems to me that our role is to try to help managers look beyond the goals and objectives of equal opportunity and affirmative action to what diversity in the workplace really means, in terms of responsiveness to our customer. That is what we have to do, in the absence of managers being able to fly on their own.

MS. SCOTTON: We have a major project called Revenue Canada. The employees as well as the Government of Canada have benefited from the project. We've used the language skills of our employees to reach a series of communities that have not paid taxes because of a lack of information. These communities now pay their taxes. One way we reached them was to circulate a memo asking employees, "Do you have a language skill or some other cultural skill that you believe would help us? Would you mind us calling you if we have a requirement for it?" Employees were delighted to be recognized and to assist us.

MS. ROBERTS: Barriers to workforce diversity in NASA include our hiring practices and attitudes towards diversity recruitment. Sometimes managers say, "We would like to recruit more diversified workers, but we find that the private sector hires the best of the best." We often grow

our own within our agency. If we find that what is feeding through our pipeline are predominantly members of one group, then hiring from within the agency also becomes a barrier to diversity.

MR. FERRIS: One of the mysteries to me is that the Federal Government has one of the most diverse workforces you are going to run across, when you look at just a straight measure of minorities and women. It should be an enormously rich source for hiring people and developing them for high-level occupations. Unfortunately, it is not.

I think one of the things MSPB can do to jump-start this effort is to teach agencies or offer them a different perspective on what types of things in the management and personnel processes can and should be measured, and then how to do this. For example, 50 percent of your workforce under grade 9 and below is made up of women, but only 20 percent over grade 12 is made up of women. Why the gap? The answer is not apparent. What should we be looking at? What should we be measuring? And how do we measure it?

Agencies with TQM and several other philosophies are buying into the idea, "Oh, I have to measure it if I want to get it," but no one has shown them how to measure where the glass ceiling or the obstacles to diversity start to take hold. I think the Board could be a real help to agencies by teaching these simple processes. Everybody tracks hiring, and most people track promotions. But not too many organizations track the distribution of incentive awards or the distribution of details to career-enhancing positions.

MS. JONES: And adverse actions.

MR. FERRIS: Someone has to present to Federal agencies an idea of how, in this somewhat homogeneous community, we can spot early the things that are going wrong. If you take a look, for instance, at the simple costs of attrition, you find out quickly they are not simple and they are very large. Costs are incurred not just for retraining but also because of reduced productivity by those who are bringing the new people on board and mentoring them, and by coworkers whose time is being spent helping them understand things.

Once managers are held accountable for managing costs, and once they know how to measure, in this case, the real costs of attrition, they see a sense of self-interest in diversity. Inclusion is clearly one way to reduce costs.

MS. MYERS: I think the idea of measurement gets far more difficult when you talk about culture. How do you measure culture? How do you measure what is happening in your workforce? Are you going to look at employee attitudes through employee surveys? Attitudes are really not a bottom-line result. When you are talking about diversity and inclusion, a bottom-line result might be, how comfortable is everybody in the environment your organization creates?

Different agencies have different cultures. For example, how can NASA, the premiere agency in the Federal Government, have any difficulty attracting and recruiting people? It has a mission that just naturally lends itself to attracting applicants. Then think about other agencies that do not offer the most popular jobs in the world. So different Federal agencies are going to have different problems in recruiting and attracting people to get a diverse workforce.

You can't wait to create a comfortable environment until you have the desired workforce diversity. Maybe we need to be working on both environment and diversity. We still need to be looking at those recruiting and retention goals that we have always had before us, and they are rather measurable.

MSPB has done some work that, at least on the Federal level, tells us where some of our problems begin with regard to obstacles in the workforce for women. The surprise in our study was that the obstacles don't begin at the GS-13 or GS-14 level. At least for women, the glass ceiling begins as low as the GS-9 level. You could do the same study within your agency and see if that is also happening there.

The question I have for the group is, when you move over into the comfort zone, if you will, how do we measure things? How will we look at comfort and how will we know if it's present other than by asking people how they feel? The

FAA is probably further along than anyone else in doing this kind of evaluation. How do you know or how can you measure the culture or environment of an organization?

I learned today that the performance of a group gets better if you have a woman in the group and astronomically better if you have minorities in the group. If there were more of that kind of data, we could actually show people a bottom line. We need to be able to say, "Here is what your organization gains through diversity" and "The economy of tomorrow and our recruitment intake of tomorrow says your applicant pool will have significant representation of women and Hispanics." To survive and to prosper, organizations must buy into workforce diversity.

MR. MOORE: Workforce diversity is not a social program. It's an economic imperative.

MR. FERRIS: My worry about that approach is that it relies on persuading folks to do good. That can be very difficult to do, especially with something as conceptually new as diversity. A lot of us are still fumbling around, trying to figure out what it is.

There is some value in putting some change processes in place. For example, use the personnel community to put some change strategies into the network and see how the strategies work. IRS is going to do an annual survey of all employees. Rather than develop an aggregate score for the average employee, the scores will be broken down by race and gender. So we are going to see how women look at the performance appraisal process and how Asians or Hispanics look at it. Do they all see the same thing?

I'm not going to convince many people that diversity is a good thing to do, but I think when I put before a group of professional managers data that show that women do not see the same thing in the awards system that men see, I will get a reaction from these managers. I will get them to change, even if, at first, they are not with me. I would urge you not to turn your back on that method. It is so tough to convince people to do the right thing.

MR. VAN RIJN: I have been sensing throughout the day that there is also a certain danger in diversity. It may separate people. We have been hearing the word "inclusion." We really want to be inclusive and also look at the shared values, the organizational values, of the culture that is driving us and what we have in common. As Carolyn Smith said this morning, we are all human beings; we have a lot more in common than we have differences.

Our Member Parks frequently talks about how Government ought to consider itself a model organization. I think when an organization does that, it needs to clearly articulate what it is about and what is important to the organization. Are there any specific recommendations as to what organizations ought to do?

MS. JENKINS: The Merit Systems Protection Board did a glass ceiling study and recommended that other agencies do the same kind of assessment of their own organizations. MSPB and the Office of Personnel Management should work with selected Federal agencies to do organizational studies. I think it is going to take a multiple agency effort. The study should identify the barriers to workforce diversity and come up with strategies to eradicate them. You have to prod the system to get there. You can start implementing your strategies in agencies that are ready, and as the others get ready, they can come aboard. Otherwise, we are going to be sitting here, one decade later, defining and talking about the differentiations and the fact that we still do not have minorities and disabled individuals and women in senior-level positions.

MS. ROBERTS: We find that a lot of decision-makers have beliefs that act as barriers to diversity, or they deny that there is a problem. We have to develop a strategy to deal with those myths that are barriers to diversity.

MS. JENKINS: Perhaps even using the power of the White House. The President has shown us a very interesting exercise and example of creating diversity and inclusiveness when he made his third nomination for the head of the Department of Justice. People asked, "My goodness, if she

has such talent, why wasn't she nominated first?" People need to know why a manager should consider holding off making a decision until he creates diversity, or even looking at the qualifications in an entirely different way. For example, the President looked for certain attorney/manager skills and certain skills in relating to the community and the customer. So the issue of whether the nominee had Federal experience became less important. We need to rethink how we evaluate qualifications for jobs. We need to rethink recruitment, and diversity helps you do that.

MR. FERRIS: I worry that the percentage of diversity at the top levels of Government, GS-13 and above or whatever, is considered to be the measure of success. I think that it is one measure of success, but I would not want it to become "the" measure of success.

For example, if a woman who learned to act like a white man gets promoted into a management position running a group of tax attorneys, is that diversity? Perhaps what is happening is that you are simply putting in place people of a different color or gender who are going to enforce the same cultural imperatives. That is not diversity. That is why it is important to cue agencies as to what to look for. Most agencies will naturally look for the mix at the executive level, and MSPB has hinted that this is a pretty good place to look. However, there are a lot of flaws around that being the only way to define success.

MR. VAN RIJN: I think you cannot go by the numbers alone. You have to go beyond that.

MS. JONES: I am concerned that when we talk "diversity," we talk basically about racial and gender issues. That is not sufficiently inclusive. For example, sexual orientation needs to be considered as an aspect of diversity. When we talk about diversity, we need to speak more inclusively.

MR. MOORE: Part of the solution will come from realizing that whatever we do, if we do it within the current hierarchical, bureaucratic paradigm, we are only taking a system that is outdated and trying to make it work better. One of the ways we're going to achieve a situation where we have

supervisors and subordinates dealing with each other in an open environment is to create organizations with fewer supervisors and more people who are empowered and involved in selecting, evaluating, and promoting their peers. There are some structural barriers in the current system that should not be in future systems.

MR. VAN RIJN: It seems to me that diversity runs along a lot of dimensions. At one point, we heard someone say that there is no diversity, and somebody else said, "Oh, but everybody has diversity." It is because diversity is on different dimensions. For example, almost every workforce tends to have older and younger workers or white- and blue-collar workers. We just recently finished doing a study of Federal blue-collar employees and found how they want to be included in the decisionmaking process. Dr. Rodela indicated that there are groups out there that have their own culture, they have their own self-identity. If we do not include them, they are going to catch their own train. That is not a good thing. So I think we want to try to look at diversity on these different levels and be inclusionary.

I particularly liked the concept of "listening sessions" of the FAA's managing diversity initiative. When I was interviewing blue-collar employees, there was tremendous enthusiasm and excitement among these workers that somebody would come and talk to them and listen to them. It was tremendously important to them that somebody from Washington came to talk with them. There is just not enough of that kind of communication going on, trying to include people and trying to help them along.

Mr. Benitez talked about how some people were willing to do menial work but don't want to do it for the rest of their lives at rock bottom wages. Yet, I saw blue-collar employees who start out at Wage Grade 1, and maybe they will end up at Wage Grade 2, and maybe if they are lucky at Wage Grade 3, and then they do that for 30 years. It is not work to be doing for 30 years, yet that still goes on.

We are not really including people and developing them to their full potential. There is an awful lot of potential being wasted. We are a tremendously diverse workforce that we could do a whole lot more with.

What are some of the other things we might focus on and do?

MS. JONES: Do the systems approach. If we can infuse the systems that already exist, that people are familiar with, and make them work to support the diversity process, I think it is going to be more productive than creating new systems. Diversity is a long-term change process. I have been in three different agencies, and they have all kinds of systems already created for doing a lot of the things we are talking about. It is the monitoring and the accountability that fall short sometimes.

MS. LOPES: This issue of systems is critical. Implement your program within your existing financial constraints. If we talk about quality management, creating diversity, and then the mission, you begin to pile too much on the manager who is trying to get the job done. Management has to accomplish all of these with no additional financial resources. The systems and people who are involved in the human resource side of the house so many times are viewed as "overhead." When we implement a diversity program, it should be accomplished within the context of the organization and the mission of the organization. Implement the program within the institutions and systems that are already there.

For those of us who are personnel practitioners, I personally feel that if we work ourselves out of a job, we will have been successful. When you talk about managers really managing human resources, there will always be processes that personnelists and EEO officials may have to do that are not managerial in nature. Some processes are clerical or support, while others—maybe working with a policy team—support the big picture. I think that in the recent past, practitioners have been too involved in what management should have been doing all along.

I have another concern. Raw numbers can be very deceiving. Outside Washington, DC, the full-performance level could be a GS-9. They are proud to be GS-9, and they make some of the best money in the community, and they are very happy.

I was very interested in what the FAA had done from the bottom up, and the employees got together and said, "This is not a comfortable working environment" and moved forward without management. That is a hard way to go.

MR. RAY: It is impossible to succeed that way, but you can get it started there.

MS. LOPES: With our dramatically changing demographics, management is going to be forced to confront the issue of diversity in the workplace. If management doesn't begin to recognize that its role is to figure out how to create an environment that is employee-friendly, it will have difficulty accomplishing its mission. As Alvin Ray said, it is impossible to succeed without that top support.

MS. ROBERTS: I support what Fran Lopes said about the power of employee involvement and encouraging our workforce to speak up. One of the most successful interventions we have experienced at NASA has been the willingness of employees to speak about the issues and to educate management. We need to develop employee teams and encourage them to express their feelings and thoughts to upper management. Management does tend to listen to them.

MS. NOWELL: In what ways would you help employees identify or link the positive benefits of diversity to a system's mission or objectives?

MR. MOORE: I have heard a number of people state that having a diverse workforce, especially in a service industry, would allow you to provide better service to your customers. Where are the data? When you can show that kind of data, and you can show that the customers value your service more and would buy more of it or would vote for more of it, then that is mission accomplishment. That is mission impact. That can make a difference to management. I am saying, whatever those values are, confirm them, and then use them to convince people.

MR. VAN RIJN: You have the last word. Thank you all very much. We will reconvene shortly for the plenary session.

Session IV: Plenary Session—Reports From Discussion Groups

Moderator: Antonio C. Amador
Merit Systems Protection Board

Group Leaders: John Crum
Charles Friedman
Karen Gard
Paul van Rijn
Merit Systems Protection Board

INTRODUCTION

MS. SWIFT: Our focus groups session will be moderated by our distinguished Vice Chairman, Antonio Amador.

MR. AMADOR: I had the opportunity to join each of the four groups during their discussions, and I saw that they really got into it. Let's have the group facilitators summarize their group's discussions in 7 minutes or less. Paul van Rijn will begin, followed by John Crum, Karen Gard, and Charles Friedman. The audience may raise questions at the end of the presentations.

PRESENTATIONS

MR. VAN RIJN: Our group thought that the business of diversity should be brought to program managers, not just to EEO and personnelists who already understand the issue's importance. We need to get managers more involved and perhaps have a conference, such as this one, with them as invitees. Also, when we talk about managers, we need to talk about managers at all

levels and not leave out the mid-level managers. Middle managers are especially important to the success of the program.

The group thought that diversity programs should be implemented within existing programs, rather than as separate programs. Diversity should be part of the day-to-day business of the organization and at all levels.

We also discussed the need to clearly articulate the benefits of diversity to the organization. Organizations should understand that diversity is an economic issue, that a bottom-line gain can be achieved by having a diverse workforce. For example, we have diverse customers, and the more diverse we are as a servicing organization the more attuned we can be to their needs.

We need to not just get diversity but to develop it and use it. There is much diversity at different levels of some organizations, but frequently not much is done with it. The Federal workforce, because of its diversity, has a tremendous potential to efficiently deliver effective programs to a



diverse constituency, but frequently we don't capitalize on that diversity. The group said MSPB should continue its leadership in this area by stimulating a multiagency effort to look at how agencies can better achieve diversity and more appropriately manage it.

MR. CRUM: Despite the speakers that we had today—and they really covered the area quite well—our group was still confused about what diversity management is all about. Basically, the group thought that there is a continuum that runs between affirmative action and EEO to diversity, and there is no clear demarcation where one starts and the other ends.

I think the confusion came about because there was a feeling that, in the move toward diversity, we should not give up things like affirmative action. Affirmative action and EEO are still needed because you can't balance a workforce through diversity training alone. In fact, you need to have a diverse workforce first before you can move to the issues of diversity. There is, however, a potential problem in defining diversity as the stepchild of affirmative action. They both have their own roles.

What is the main role of diversity? The group came to a consensus that the role is, as Mr. Ray mentioned, to change organizational culture. But this is a difficult thing to do because usually that means changing tradition, which is very difficult to change. Traditions have long-standing background associated with them, and people can only change them slowly, over time. Organizations need to make changes at every step they can, but they can't expect things to happen in just 1 day. Diversity is an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process. The key to that evolution is, as Paul's group said, convincing management and the people in the organization that it is in the organization's best interest to change. An organization can become more effective and better able to meet its mission, by having a diverse workforce.

The final point the group made was also very similar to one made by Paul's group. Some organizations need to take leadership and push for this evolutionary change. Even though change happens over time, agents of change are needed. Those agents could take several different forms. MSPB, OPM, and perhaps the EEOC could get together in some way to be a proponent for continuing the push toward diversity.

MS. GARD: Our group started off talking about diversity versus assimilation. We thought that a lot of diversity and a little assimilation might be a good thing. That is, the organizations need to find their core values—the things that they all agree on. Once the common principles are identified, they can move practice and principles closer together.

We talked about whether management and the workforce should work through consensus or collaboration. The group thought that a combination of both would be better. We need to find the things we can agree on and work from there.

Another topic was that we seem to have a hard time facing the hard issues. For example, Van Swift pointed out earlier our reluctance to discuss race. I didn't hear the word "race" too often today, although we need to talk about it. White males are not the only ones guilty of racism; we all are. We are all the victims, to a certain degree, of how we were raised and where we came from.

We have to fight racism, but it's not something you can easily discuss in an afternoon with a group of 10 or 12 strangers. Not that racism and other issues brought here today should not be

discussed. They have to be addressed in order to deal with diversity, but we have to do it in a different form, or perhaps give us more time, so that we could become comfortable with each other and open ourselves up to differing ideas.

We discussed how managers could change an organization's culture. We put a lot of burden on managers to do well. It is imperative that managers learn techniques that draw out the best in all of their employees. Several group members pointed out that this includes drawing out the best in the white males just as much as any other groups.

It was pointed out that with budget cuts coming, we can no longer emphasize production over employees or vice versa. We must emphasize both. We agreed that diversity is only one aspect of workforce management, but it should be highlighted because managing diversity is an economic imperative. Through managing diversity we can get the best out of our people. Because managing diversity has an economic impact, we do have to be careful in the coming years. As we cut back or do not hire, we must not use budget cutbacks as an excuse to undermine the move toward appropriate workforce representation.





MR. FRIEDMAN: The group started out discussing how to get top management support. Everybody during the day made the point of how necessary it was to have it, but we didn't seem to have really gotten a lot of specifics as to what an agency should actually do to get it.

We all could learn from the Air Force. They set up a task force with managers and nonmanagers, people from the top and from the bottom, military and nonmilitary, as members. Such a group has more credibility to talk to top management about workforce diversity than just the EEO officer, for example.

Further, the point was made that simply getting top management support does not solve the problem. For example, in some organizations, there was very strong support from top management but none from the middle. Because of this, the program went nowhere. To the extent that

diversity is a serious objective, it needs to be worked, and worked consistently, and worked across the board. The group discussed ways to get support and commitment from managers. One way is to include performance standards on diversity in the evaluation and rewards process. That has some pluses and some minuses. The use of performance standards as a strategy will succeed only if expectations are clearly spelled out, and standards are clear and quantifiable. Otherwise, using performance standards as a means to get support for diversity will not work.

Another thing agencies could do to make their diversity program work is to involve nonminorities. The program needs involvement of people all across the organization. Someone said that some of the most effective advocates are people who might have started out with an opposing point of view. Once converted to the cause, like reformed smokers or drinkers, they can be very insistent in getting the point across.

Closing Remarks

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN WORKFORCE DIVERSITY

Antonio C. Amador
Vice Chairman

As your last speaker on the program today, I wondered if my remarks were going to be relevant, after hearing all the tremendous presentations today. What I am going to say today is obviously another diverse viewpoint about diversity.

You do not have to agree with me, but I am often reminded that there were times when my own diverse viewpoint was not ever going to be listened to if I did not get up and move from where I was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, to California. So times are changing, and a lot of things are happening. Now, the hour is late, and my comments will be brief.

The first thing I want to do is commend people for their thought-provoking dialogue on our topic of diversity. Van Swift and the Office of Policy and Evaluation are to be commended for their superb coordination of this diversity symposium.

With regard to diversity, we need only to look at ourselves to realize that it does work. As I said, I went into all four of the sessions and realized that the folks were really making progress, and you were all diverse.

I was pleased to be able to participate in today's program, which was sparked by Member Parks' suggestion to have this event. I believe it is fitting that the Merit Systems Protection Board took the

lead in developing this symposium. After all, the Board does play a role in the Federal merit system's need to engender a work environment that serves the employees, agencies, and, we cannot forget, the public we exist to serve.

At the Merit Systems Protection Board, we can also take pride in the fact that our Board represents diversity. Chairman Levinson is Jewish, with some Russian roots, and happens to be from the East Coast, and I guess I can use the word "New York." Member Parks is Protestant and is from the South and has some Scottish in her. I am Catholic and from the great, Western State of California, even though I was born in Utah.

Our diverse backgrounds—which include our religious, cultural, ethnic, political, geographic, and philosophical makeup—have enabled us to appreciate one another even more than if we were peas from the same pod.

As we have learned—and you as practitioners in the field probably already know—diversity is valuing each person as an individual and appreciating and respecting differences among people. These differences, of course, include differences in appearance, culture, philosophy, and outlook. Diversity may be people of different ages and economic backgrounds. It may be people of different races, ethnic groups, religions, and cultures, as well as those with varying physical and mental abilities.

Appreciation of diversity does not mean that you must enjoy jalapenos, nor do I need to like grits. Fried plantains and reggae may not be my cup of tea, but to some, mariachi music may not have soul. What is important is that we respect each other's cultural differences.

Prior to coming to the Board, I had not been exposed to as many different cultures as I have since arriving in Washington, DC. It has been a very good education for me. If you just took the cab drivers alone in Washington, DC, there are Nigerians, Ethiopians, Afghans, Hindus, Latins from Peru and El Salvador, and people from various other countries. It gives you a good idea of what diversity is, and these cab drivers seem to be doing a good job in Washington, DC.

The fact that Member Parks' husband, who is from the South and attended college in Tennessee, can speak better Spanish than I, opened my eyes to the fact that others respect my culture enough to learn Spanish. Diversity allows us to enjoy someone else's differentness and places a responsibility on each of us to try to share in our individual uniqueness.

As we conclude today's program, I cannot help but think of the good intentions of everyone who attended today's symposium. However, the attainment of the goal of acceptance of workforce diversity as a benefit and necessity in today's changing workforce requires more than just good intentions. The mindset or road map we have been using, which has coined terms such as equal employment, affirmative action, and other such phrases, does not adequately address our need to change our paradigm, a paradigm that impedes a diverse workforce.

The changes that are necessary are attitudinal. We just cannot empty out people's heads and pour in a diverse workforce paradigm. The training, management, organizational, and cultural issues that become the challenges of our workforce leaders require an educational program that convinces everyone that diversity is not a four-letter word.

Diversity can enhance everyone's working conditions and not just those of minorities or other underrepresented classes of people. We must adopt an attitude of abundance and not continue thinking, to a large degree, with a scarcity mentality. I think, as Eduardo Rodela said earlier today, and he said it right, it should not be viewed as a shrinking pie but one that is large enough to share.

The promotion of a young Asian does not equate to the firing or the limiting of opportunity for a middle-aged white male. Opportunities and promotions for Hispanics do not, in my mind's eye, mean reverse discrimination or detriment to the promotions or opportunities of white males.

Quite frankly, I have been embarrassed and agitated by the leveling of the playing field that sometimes takes place in some affirmative action and some EEO programs. Personally, I would not have received the demanding opportunities in life were it not for the assistance of those white males.

From the president of the Police Protective League in Los Angeles, to the chairman of the Youthful Offender Parole Board, to the director of the California Youth Authority, to the deputy director of the Employment Development Department, and, as Vice Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, these jobs have all come with the support and encouragement of white males who were not threatened by my empowerment.

Diversity does not mean displacement. It means, "I am here. I cannot be ignored. Give me a chance. I am different, and I can make a difference." Diversity also means, "Give me a chance to prove myself. I have something in addition to the requisite job skills to contribute to the workplace."

In closing, I am reminded of the exhibition at the Museum of Natural History called "The Seeds of Change." The Old World joined the New World. The outsiders from Europe arrived and found a culture that was advanced enough to appreciate corn and potatoes, yet not prepared for diseases

and domination. Though it was a rough melding of various cultures and peoples, the country we live in is all that much better off for the diversity that took place.

We have reached a point in workforce reality where the reintroduction of diversity will reinvigorate our country and commence a new

dawn of diversity that tempers the steel of America's workforce. Workforce diversity will not be accomplished without some pain. As personnel practitioners and leaders in the field, the challenge is ours.

This concludes our program for today. Thank you very much.

Appendix A: Acknowledgments

We wish to express our appreciation to the conference recorders who recorded each of the group discussions and prepared detailed notes which helped in preparing this report:

Keith Bell
Ligaya J. Fernandez
Jamie Carlyle
Harry C. Redd III

We also want to thank our technical staff who provided administrative support for the conference, and for the production of this report:

Sandra Armuth
Ida B. Fairnot
Annette Johnson
Bobby Timberlake

And, the Board is especially thankful to the management and staff of The Annenberg Washington Program of Northwestern University for the use of their facility.

Appendix B: Conference Program

The Changing Face of the Federal Workforce: A Symposium on Diversity

Wednesday, February 17, 1993

- 8:00 a.m. REGISTRATION**
- 9:00 a.m. WELCOMING REMARKS**
- Evangeline W. Swift, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation,
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board*
- 9:15 a.m. OPENING REMARKS**
**"Managing Diversity Appropriately: A Merit System
Obligation"**
- Daniel R. Levinson, Chairman
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board*
- 9:30 a.m. SESSION I. PANEL DISCUSSION**
**"The Challenges of Managing Diversity in the
Federal Workforce"**
- Moderator:**
- Bernard L. Ungar, Director, Federal Human Resource Management
Issues, U.S. General Accounting Office*
- Panelists:**
- Ben Benitez, Director for Human Resources, Library of Congress*
- Ronnie Blumenthal, Director, Office of Federal Operations,
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*
- Carolyn J. Smith, Director, Office of Personnel,
U.S. Small Business Administration*
- Donald W. Worden, Director, Career Development and Training
Division, U.S. General Services Administration*
- 10:30 a.m. BREAK**

10:45 a.m. PANEL DISCUSSION, Continued

12:00 Noon LUNCH

1:00 p.m. SESSION II. PANEL PRESENTATION
"Implementing Diversity Programs in Federal Agencies"

Moderator:

Jessica L. Parks, Member
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

Panelists:

Darlene V. Floyd, Diversity Officer, EEO Staff, Internal Revenue
Service, U.S. Department of the Treasury

Alvin E. Ray, Manager, Human Resource Management Division, Great
Lakes Region, Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of
Transportation

C. Shannon Roberts, Assistant to the Associate Administrator, Office
of Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Eduardo S. Rodela, Hispanic Programs Coordinator,
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

2:45 p.m. BREAK

3:00 p.m. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Facilitators:

<i>John L. Crum</i>	<i>Karen K. Gard</i>
<i>Charles E. Friedman</i>	<i>Paul van Rijn</i>
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board	

4:00 p.m. BREAK

4:15 p.m. PLENARY SESSION
"Report From Small Group Discussions"

Moderator:

Antonio C. Amador, Vice Chairman
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

4:45 p.m. CLOSING REMARKS
"Future Directions in Workforce Diversity"

Antonio C. Amador, Vice Chairman
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

5:00 p.m. ADJOURNMENT

Appendix C: Biographies of Speakers, Panelists, and Facilitators

Antonio C. Amador is Vice Chairman of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. He joined the Board on November 1, 1990, following his nomination by President Bush and confirmation by the Senate. At the time of his appointment, Mr. Amador was Deputy Director, Program Review Branch, Employment Development Department of the State of California. Previously, he served as Director of the California Youth Authority, as Chairman of the Youthful Offender Parole Board in California, and as a police officer in the Los Angeles Police Department. Mr. Amador received his law degree from the McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific.

Ben Benitez is Director of Human Resources of the Library of Congress. He recently developed and negotiated the Library's Multi-Year Affirmative Action Plan for fiscal years 1992 through 1994, which is considered a "moral milestone" in the Library's 200-year history. Mr. Benitez has 23 years' expertise in personnel with assignments with the U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Mint, U.S. Department of Labor, and Library of Congress. In many of his positions, his focus has been on affirmative action and workforce diversity, especially in the recruitment and development of minorities. Mr. Benitez received his bachelor's and master's degrees in business administration from Loyola University. He currently chairs the U.S. Office of Personnel Management's Hispanic Federal Employment Advisory Group.

Ronnie Blumenthal was appointed Director of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Office of Federal Operations in June 1992. In addition, she chairs the EEOC's Executive Resources Board and Performance Review Board. Prior to her appointment as Director of the Office of Federal Operations, Ms. Blumenthal was Director of the Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs and the Systemic Investigations and Individual Compliance Programs of the EEOC. In 1980, she was assigned to the Executive Office of the President to participate in the Presidential Review of the President's Reorganization Plan Number 1 of 1978. She was selected as a Legislative Fellow in 1982, and in that capacity served as a staff member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. She earned both her B.A. and J.D. degrees from The George Washington University and completed the Senior Management in Government Program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

John L. Crum is a Senior Research Psychologist with the Office of Policy and Evaluation of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. In this capacity he has produced or contributed to reports concerning issues such as the quality of the Federal procurement workforce, OPM recruitment initiatives, sexual harassment in the Federal workforce, and the glass ceiling faced by women in the Federal Government. Before joining MSPB in 1985, Dr. Crum served as a Research Psychologist with the U.S. Department of the Army, where most of his work was in program evaluation. This evaluation work included responsibility for numerous surveys of the Army's civilian workforce. He was also responsible for developing the first system for projecting the Army's long-term requirements for a variety of civilian positions and allocating resources for their development. Dr. Crum received his B.A. degree in psychology and math from Boston University and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in psychology from the University of Florida.

Darlene V. Floyd is Servicewide Diversity Program Manager on the staff of the Assistant to the Commissioner (Equal Opportunity), Internal Revenue Service. Ms. Floyd is also a support person to the Deputy Commissioner and the Executive Sponsor Group and has program management responsibilities for IRS' National Diversity Program. Her most recent prior position was Chief, Management Programs Training, with responsibility for the design, development, and policy for IRS' management and resources management professional training, which included the Management Achievement Program, the Leadership Excellence and Development program, and ethics and diversity-related training. She began her IRS career in 1977 as a Taxpayer Service Representative in Jacksonville, FL, and moved to the National Office in 1985 to serve as an Employee Development Specialist. Ms. Floyd is the Cultural Awareness Chairperson for the Northern Virginia chapter of Federally Employed Women.

Charles E. Friedman has been a Senior Research Analyst with the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board's Office of Policy and Evaluation since 1987. During this period, he has completed three major Board studies, including a study concerning Federal employees and the issue of balancing work responsibilities and family needs. Currently, Mr. Friedman is leading the Board's research efforts on "glass ceiling" issues affecting minorities in the Federal Government. Before joining MSPB, Mr. Friedman served in a variety of increasingly responsible positions with the Internal Revenue Service, spanning a 16-year time period. These included several assignments related to position classification and position management, culminating in his designation as the Technical Advisor and Special Projects Manager in IRS's Position Management Branch. Mr. Friedman received his bachelor's degree in chemistry from Long Island University in 1970.

Karen K. Gard is a Research Analyst with the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board's Office of Policy and Evaluation. She has over a decade of experience as a Personnel Management Specialist with the U.S. Department of the Army and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior, and also served as a Program Analyst for the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Management Systems. Ms. Gard attended Northwestern University, received a bachelor's degree from the University of Illinois, and is a graduate of The George Washington University's publications management program.

Daniel R. Levinson is the former Chairman of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. He became Board Chairman on August 15, 1986, following his nomination by President Reagan and confirmation by the Senate. At the time of his appointment, Mr. Levinson was General Counsel of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, a position he had held since March 1985. Previously, he served for 2 years as Deputy General Counsel of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Before joining OPM, Mr. Levinson was, for 6 years, an associate and partner in the Washington, DC, law firm of McGuinness & Williams, where he represented primarily private sector management in a wide variety of employment law matters.

Jessica L. Parks is the Member of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. She took the oath of office as the Member of the Board on May 18, 1990, following her nomination by President Bush and confirmation by the Senate. At the time of her appointment, Ms. Parks was Associate Regional Counsel for Litigation and Program Enforcement for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in Atlanta. From 1982 to 1985, she served as an administrative judge in MSPB's Atlanta Regional Office. Previously, she was Agency Counsel for the Craven County Department of Social Services in New Bern, NC. She has also been in private practice in Jacksonville, NC, and was an associate in the firm of Bowers and Sledge in New Bern.

Alvin E. Ray has been Manager of the Human Resource Management Division of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Aviation Administration Great Lakes Region since April 1990. Before becoming the Human Resource Manager, he held numerous supervisory positions within the FAA's Great Lakes Region, including the position of Equal Employment Officer and Assistant Personnel Officer. Before joining the FAA, Mr. Ray was Chief of the Position Programs Section of the Internal Revenue Service's Midwest Regional Office. Mr. Ray started his Federal career with the U.S. Department of the Navy as a Management Analyst. He has a B.A. degree in philosophy from Wayne State University and an M.A. from Roosevelt University.

C. Shannon Roberts is Assistant to the Associate Administrator for Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. She is also serving as Director of Benchmarking and External Programs, NASA Office of Continual Improvement. Ms. Roberts has over 23 years of Federal, State, and local government, and corporate sector experience in the areas of policy, program, budget, financial management, management planning, quality improvement, intersector relations, human resource management, information resource management, public relations, and organizational development and effectiveness. She has also worked at the U.S. Departments of Transportation and Justice, the Xerox Corporation, and the North Carolina Department of Corrections. She received her bachelor of arts degree in political science (with honors) from the University of North Carolina and her master of public administration degree (with distinction) from the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Ms. Roberts is a doctoral candidate in public administration at the University of Southern California.

Eduardo Rodela is a Human Resource and Organization Analyst with the Policy and Research Division, Office of Human Resources Management, of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Dr. Rodela has been actively involved in workforce diversity, total quality management, and self-directed work team initiatives with EPA. He came to EPA from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. He is a Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve Medical Service Corp, where he serves as a psychiatric social worker. Dr. Rodela is a graduate of the University of Michigan's organizational psychology program (1985) and the School of Social Work (1972).

Carolyn J. Smith was appointed Director of Personnel of the U.S. Small Business Administration in October 1992. Before becoming Director of Personnel, Ms. Smith served as SBA's Deputy Director and Director of the Office of Personnel Services. Ms. Smith started her Government career with the U.S. Department of the Navy as an intern and progressed through a variety of positions before deciding on a career in personnel. She left the Navy Department to join the U.S. General Services Administration, where she held the position of Chief of Classification before moving to SBA. Ms. Smith is an honors graduate of Johnson C. Smith University.

Evangeline W. Swift was appointed Director of Policy and Evaluation of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board in December 1987. She had previously served as MSPB's Managing Director and was its General Counsel from 1979 to 1986. Previously, she was at the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where she held the positions of Assistant General Counsel; Chief, Decisions Division; Executive Legal Assistant to the Chairman; and Special Assistant to the Vice Chairman. She also served as the Ranking Staff Attorney with the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity's Headstart Program, and as an attorney-advisor at the U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission. Ms. Swift is a founder of the Federal Circuit Bar Association and was its President in 1991-92. She is a graduate of St. Mary's School of Law, a member of the Texas and District of Columbia Bars, and is admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and several U.S. Courts of Appeals.

Bernard L. Ungar is Federal Human Resource Management Issues Director of the U.S. General Accounting Office. He is responsible for directing much of GAO's work in the areas of classification, compensation, staffing, performance management, and ethics. Mr. Ungar has held a variety of positions in GAO over the last 23 years, including directing GAO's 1988 transition project. He is a CPA and a graduate of Ohio University and the Kennedy School's Senior Executive Fellows program.

Paul van Rijn is a Senior Research Psychologist in the Office of Policy and Evaluation of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. At MSPB, his activities have included studies of who is leaving the Federal civil service and why, and he has recently completed an overview of employment issues facing the Government's blue-collar workforce. Before joining MSPB in 1987, he was with the U.S. Army Research Institute in Alexandria, VA, where he conducted research on organizational productivity, leadership and management, and Army civilian personnel issues. Dr. van Rijn began his Federal career in 1974 with the Personnel Research and Development Center of the former U.S. Civil Service Commission. During his 8 years there, he developed employee selection tests and conducted research in support of the Federal civil service examining

system. He recently authored a monograph for the International Personnel Management Association on the use of biodata in employee selection procedures. Dr. van Rijn received his B.A. from the University of San Francisco in 1967 and his Ph.D. in experimental psychology from the University of Colorado in 1974.

Donald W. Worden has been Director of the Career Development and Training Division of the U.S. General Services Administration since 1987. He has held a variety of increasingly responsible management positions with GSA since 1971. Mr. Worden started his Federal career with the U.S. Department of the Navy as a management intern. He received his bachelor's degree in economics from Purdue University and is a graduate of the Federal Executive Institute.

Appendix D: List of Participants

Sarah D. Adams
Assistant Director
Research and Information
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
(202) 632-0532

Dora G. Alcala
Deputy for Equal Opportunity
U.S. Department of the Air Force
(703) 607-3167

Baltazar Baca
General Counsel, National IMAGE, Inc.
(202) 628-7169

Adalberto Bernal
Associate Director for Workforce Effectiveness
U.S. Department of the Navy
(703) 607-1816

Claudette Boulden
Director, Equal Employment Opportunity
U.S. Government Printing Office
(202) 512-2014

Marion Bowden
National President
Blacks In Government
(202) 667-3280

Veronica O. Collazo
Vice President, Diversity Development
U.S. Postal Service
(202) 268-6566

Frank Cipolla
Assistant to the President
National Academy of Public Administration
(202) 205-8094

Jean Curtis
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Public Service
(202) 724-0796

Ellen M. Dowd
Personnel Officer
National Institute of Standards and Technology
U.S. Department of Commerce
(301) 975-3000

Anna Maria Farias
Board Member, Wage Appeals
U.S. Department of Labor
(202) 219-9039

Frank Ferris
Director of Negotiations
National Treasury Employees Union
(202) 783-4444

Larry Goodwin
Director of Personnel
U.S. Department of Labor
(202) 219-6551

Capt. S. Rob Hardman
Workforce Diversity Staff
U.S. Coast Guard
(202) 267-2866

Carol Hayashida
Personnel Staffing Specialist
U.S. Department of Commerce
(202) 482-5372

Warren L. Hobbs
Acting Division Director
Office of Special Emphasis Studies and Analysis
Social Security Administration
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
(410) 965-9662

List of Participants

O. David Jackson
Personnel Management Specialist
U.S. Department of Labor
(202) 219-6533

Harriett Jenkins
Director, Office of Senate Fair
Employment Practices
U.S. Senate
(202) 224-6666

Ms. Gwen Jones
Special Assistant for Diversity
Federal Aviation Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
(202) 366-6674

Ellis Jones-Hodges
Associate Director
Affirmative Employment Service
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs
(202) 233-3887

Fran Lopes
Assistant Director, Affirmative
Recruiting and Employment
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
(202) 606-1059

Gail Lovelace
Deputy Director of Personnel
U.S. General Services Administration
(202) 501-0398

Paul Mahoney
Director, Office of Management Analysis
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board
(202) 653-5806

Shirley Martinez
Associate Director
Office of Affirmative Employment and
Civil Rights
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 260-4575

Dorothy Meletzke
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Civilian Personnel Policy/EEO
U.S. Department of the Navy
(703) 695-2633

John Moore
Human Resources Specialist
Internal Revenue Service
U.S. Department of the Treasury
(202) 401-4309

Lucretia F. Myers
Executive Director
U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board
(202) 653-6842

Antonia Nowell
Professor of Public Administration
University of the District of Columbia
(202) 282-3701

Manuel Olivarez
Executive Director, National Association
of Hispanic Federal Executives
(202) 289-1380

Patsy Parham
Employee Development Specialist
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
(202) 358-2177

James R. Perez
Chief, EEO Affairs
Federal Bureau of Investigation
U.S. Department of Justice
(202) 324-4128

Barbara Rosenfeld
Vice President, Council for Excellence
in Government
(202) 728-0418

Mark Roth
General Counsel
American Federation of Government Employees
(202) 639-6415

Luther Santiful
Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Agency
U.S. Department of the Army
(703) 607-1976

Phillip Savage
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Operations
U.S. Department of Housing and
Urban Development
(202) 708-4211

Anne Scotton
Director General
Departmental Coordination and Regional
Operations
Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada
Quebec, Canada
(819) 994-7798

Tom Simon
Senior Associate
Organization Development Systems, Inc.
(703) 532-5712

Danny Smith
Executive Assistant
Federal National Mortgage Association
(202) 752-6627

Rosemarie Straight
Deputy Executive Director
for Management
Federal Trade Commission
(202) 326-2022

Debra Tomchek
Personnel Management Specialist
Office of Systems Innovation
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
(202) 606-2810

Howard Toy
Personnel and Benefits Manager
U.S. Institute of Peace
(202) 357-1301

Richard Williams
Chief of Recruitment and Staffing
Office of Personnel
U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of the Interior
(703) 648-7442

Blue Wooldridge
Associate Professor
Virginia Commonwealth University
(804) 367-1047

ISBN 0-16-041945-X



90000

9 780160 419454

U.S. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Recently Released Reports

- "Federal Personnel Offices: Time for Change?" (*August 1993*)
- "Federal Personnel Research Programs and Demonstration Projects: Catalysts for Change." (*December 1992*)
- "Federal Blue-Collar Employees: A Workforce in Transition." (*December 1992*)
- "Civil Service Evaluation: The Role of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management." (*November 1992*)
- "A Question of Equity: Women and the Glass Ceiling in the Federal Government." (*October 1992*)
- "Federal Workforce Quality: Measurement and Improvement." (*The final report of an interagency committee focusing on Federal workforce quality. Published August 1992*)
- "Workforce Quality and Federal Procurement: An Assessment." (*July 1992*)
- "Federal First-Line Supervisors: How Good Are They?" (*March 1992*)
- "To Meet the Needs of the Nations: Staffing the U.S. Civil Service and the Public Service of Canada." (*January 1992*)
- "Balancing Work Responsibilities and Family Needs: The Federal Civil Service Response." (*November 1991*)
- "The Title 38 Personnel System in the Department of Veterans Affairs: An Alternate Approach" (*April 1991*)
- "Senior Executive Service Pay Setting and Reassignments: Expectations vs. Reality" (*October 1990*)
- "Working for America: A Federal Employee Survey" (*June 1990*)
- "Why are Employees Leaving the Federal Government? Results of an Exit Survey" (*May 1990*)
- "Attracting and Selecting Quality Applicants for Federal Employment" (*April 1990*)

For a copy of any Office of Policy and Evaluation report, please contact:

**U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board
Office of Policy and Evaluation
1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Room 884
Washington, DC 20419
(202) 653-7208
V/TDD (202) 653-8896**

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board
1120 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20419

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
WASHINGTON, DC
PERMIT NO. G-113

***The Changing Face
of the Federal Workforce***
A Symposium on Diversity

